

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

JOHN LEWIS GILLIN
University of Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The origin of sociology in the United States. — Why sociology arose in the United States following the Civil War. Character of early sociology in the United States. Characterization of the sociology of the pioneers Ward, Sumner, Small, Giddings, Ross, Cooley, Thomas. Tendencies in early American sociology. Development of sociology in the United States since the pioneers. Relation of sociology to social work. Sociology as a university subject. Hesitancy to use the term "sociology" in university curricula. The progress of sociology.

Sociology is usually supposed to have begun with Comte. As a matter of fact, however, there were a number of presociological movements, in which certain men manifested the beginning of the sociological attitude. To a sociologist it looks as if those responsible for the abolition of slavery in the British colonies had sociological insight. Chalmers, in his objective study of dependency in his parish in Edinburgh, and in his policy based on that study, showed a sociological attitude. Pinel, who as the result of his study of the results of the traditional methods of treating the insane, struck off the restraints and adopted humane methods, attacked the problem as a modern sociologist. Beccaria, in so far as he faced frankly the effects of age-old methods of treating the criminal and suggested other methods based upon a study of results, was a sociologist.

The striking thing about all of these examples is that the men mentioned adopted a new attitude in the study of social problems. A frank skepticism characterized them. They refused to accept the traditional attitudes and policies. They questioned the working of the dominant policies. They sought to understand the processes by which the observed results were brought about. That is what may be called a presociological approach to sociology.

It is just fifty years since Professor Sumner at Yale gave what is usually thought of as the first course in sociology in the United States. However, Thorpe, in his *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania*, says that Professor Thompson gave such a course at that institution in 1874. As a text Sumner used Spencer's *Sociology* (probably his *Principles of Sociology*, not his *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*), which was then appearing in parts. After a year or so the course disappeared to

appear again about 1885 as "social science," under which title sociology has been given at Yale to the present time. In 1881 Professor Dunstan offered a course called "social science" at Michigan. It was not until 1883 that the first American book on sociology, Lester F. Ward's *Dynamic Sociology*, appeared. In 1885 Professor Woodford gave a course in sociology at Indiana. In 1889 President Albion W. Small started a small class in Sociology at Colby University. In the same year Professor Frank W. Blackmar introduced sociology at the University of Kansas. In 1890 Professor Franklin H. Giddings announced a course on "Modern Theories of Sociology" at Bryn Mawr College. In 1891 Professor Edward A. Ross gave his first course in sociology at University of Indiana. In 1892 appeared Ward's *Psychic Factors of Civilization*, and in 1893 the Department of Sociology was opened at the new University of Chicago.* In 1894 a chair of sociology was established at Columbia University, and Professor Giddings was invited to occupy it. Such was the origin of sociology in the United States and its development during the first eighteen years of its history.

WHY THE RISE OF SOCIOLOGY AT THIS TIME?

How shall we account for the fact that such great interest was manifested in sociology at just this time? Were there any conditions in the life of the people of the United States which excited an interest in these questions? Were there any conditions in the world situation which contributed to this interest?

It is significant that interest in sociology arose in the United States just after the Civil War. It has been suggested that the War left this country with many problems which challenged the attention of men. It had rocked the social structure of our people to its foundations. It had challenged thinking men to a reconsideration of the fundamental problems of government and social relationships. Like every important war, the Civil War and its after-results disturbed the settled status of classes and raised questions concerning settled opinions, and to thinking minds presented the challenge of re-examining some of our fundamental notions. It was a time when social readjustment was necessary and new relationships had to be established.

It was in 1865 that the American Social Science Association was formed in Boston along the lines of the British Social Science Association founded a quarter of a century before. Mr. Frank Sanborn, one of the founders of the American Social Science Association, attributes its origin to the necessity of studying these new questions raised by the Civil War.¹

Whatever the causes, about this time a flood of graduate students was going from this country to the European universities, chiefly those in Germany, for study. Professor Small of the University of Chicago readily remembered fifteen important scholars of the United States who studied in the German universities in the seventies. These

* Since this way put in type Professor Graham Taylor tells me that about the same time, he became the first teacher of sociology in a Theological Seminary.

¹ *Publications, American Sociological Society*, IV, 16, 17.

returned to the United States inspired by a new spirit and by the methods of their German teachers. These men, and men trained under them in the universities of this country, gave a new direction and inspired a fresh interest in such social studies as history, political science, and economics. Even the casual list recalled by Professor Small suggest some of the most important leaders in the development of the social studies in the United States. The spirit of German scholarship had made its mark on the thought of these young Americans who had returned from Europe and were leading the new educational adventures in our growing American universities.²

There these American students came in contact with stimulating intellectual personalities teaching in the German universities and expounding new doctrines and using new methods. How this stream of young American students came to be started toward the German universities it is impossible at this time to say. It has been suggested that Francis Lieber, who had come to the United States in 1827 and held the chair of history and political economy in Columbia University from 1856 to 1860, and from that date until his death was professor of Political Science in the Law School of Columbia University, and who had published his *Civil Liberty and Self-Government* in 1852, may have had some hand in developing this migration and certainly had something to do with the new intellectual interest in economics, political science, and history following the Civil War.

While the influence of the German universities on the young men from America was vital in creating an interest in the various social studies, the specific impetus for the development of sociology in this country came by way of English influence. Three men, one of them a Frenchman, two of them Englishmen, through their published works exercised an undoubted influence upon the minds of young Americans trying to think themselves through a maze of new problems. Comte published in French his *Course of Positive Philosophy* from 1830-42, and his *System of Positive Polity* from 1851 to 1854. His influence reached Americans through his original works or through Harriet Martineau's translation, published in England in 1853, and the second edition in 1875. Spencer published his *Study of Sociology* in 1873 and the first volume of his *Principles of Sociology* in 1874. Bagehot published his *Physics and Politics* in 1869. The pioneers in sociology in the United States all confess their debt to these early sociologists.

Consider, then, the early flowering of this new impulse in the United States. Lester F. Ward published his *Dynamic Sociology* in 1883. As a paleobotanist in the government service at Washington, Ward shows the influence of Comte and Spencer. Until the last years of his life he was not a teacher of sociology. His *Dynamic Sociology*, however, had a great influence upon thoughtful scholars in the social sciences in the United States. In 1888 he delivered an address before the American Economic Association entitled "Social and Economic Paradoxes." In this address he showed the psychological trend of his thought which got complete expression in his *Psychic Factors of Civilization* in 1892. He gave further expression to his emphasis upon

² A. W. Small, *Origins of Sociology*, footnote 2, pp. 325 f.

psychology in social relationships in an address entitled "The Psychologic Basis of Social Economics" in 1893.

Andrew D. White, president of Cornell, moving in an atmosphere of European thought on university education in the early eighties, had been making plans to introduce a course at Cornell which should acquaint students with the practical social problems of that day. In 1885 he got Frank B. Sanborn, of Massachusetts, to give such a course at Cornell for the first time.

Professor Frank W. Blackmar, of Kansas, was one of that large group of men who had been attracted to the Johns Hopkins to study with Herbert Adams and with Dr. Ely. He returned to Kansas in 1889 as head of the Department of History and Political Science and began giving a course in sociology.³

In addition to these men just cited, other leading educators were feeling the necessity of introducing a new spirit and new methods into university education, as was manifested by President Angell at Michigan and some other important leaders. The whole movement was a manifest sign that there was a growing feeling here in the United States for a new interpretation of social relationships as they were being worked out in the new United States following the Civil War. The political scientists, influenced by the new attitudes in political science which had grown up in Germany, began to make new appraisals of the nature of government in view of the new problems before the government of the United States. The historians under German influences were in full cry after a new method in the interpretation of the facts of American history. Most of these early American sociologists had been trained in history, political science, and economics. Coming, however, under the influence of Comte and Spencer, and a little later on under that of Lester F. Ward, they became conscious in a vague way at first that economics, politics, and history did not include all of the field of human association. It is out of this feeling that we see the emergence, among such early sociologists as Giddings and Small, of the contention that more of the social factors must be taken into account and social processes must be invoked to explain the economic theories then held. How much early American sociologists owed in the first place to the sympathetic tolerance of the economists and later to the sharp criticism of their sociological formulations by the economists it is impossible at this time to state. From one point of view the sociologists might be properly classified as the left wing of the new economists. From another point of view they were simply extending the analysis and the methods of inquiry which the German-trained economists, political scientists, and historians were already using. They were proposing to apply the same methods of study to wider reaches of human relationships. Only gradually did their concepts of sociology become more definite and clear.

THE CHARACTER OF EARLY SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

³ *American Journal of Sociology* (May, 1916), p. 760.

The early sociologists in this country had been trained as scholars in other fields. Sumner was an economist. Small at first was trained as a theologian, then as a political scientist and historian. Giddings, trained as a journalist, for a number of years was very active in the American Economic Association. Ross was trained as a philologist and economist. Lester F. Ward was a paleobotanist who spent most of his life in the service of the government at Washington. Small and Ross were influenced by their experience in Germany, and all of them were profoundly affected by the writings of Comte and Spencer. Those who became interested in sociology after Ward had written were influenced by his view of sociology. Small and Ross have given personal testimony of their debt to Ward early in their careers, while the debt of Giddings was easily seen in his *Principles of Sociology* published in 1896. The early writings of all these men show the influence of their previous training.

Let us turn, then, to characterize as well as we may the outstanding points among these early sociologists. The earliest American sociologist was Lester F. Ward. His *Dynamic Sociology* appeared in 1883. Unlike those of the other pioneers cited, Ward's ideas were fairly well matured when he wrote his first book. It may almost be said that his later writings were merely elaborations of points which he developed in his *Dynamic Sociology*. To put the matter as briefly as possible, Ward was primarily interested in correcting what he thought were errors in Comte and Spencer. He devoted himself with untiring energy to supplementing Comte's hierarchy of the sciences and to showing that Spencer's correction thereof was wrong. The other great contribution of Ward was his emphasis upon the psychic factors in the development of culture or civilization. The logical scheme in which he presented his reflections bear the impress of his scientific career. It was incidental to his main contribution, and has not been followed by most other American sociologists. His emphasis upon the importance of the psychic elements in social evolution was a foil to Spencer's materialism and was of the greatest possible significance. He also made important contributions in minor ways, such as suggesting that evolution has not been continuous and direct, but sympodial. Whatever may be said of his scheme of sociology the importance of this vigorous thinker to American sociology is very great.

William Graham Sumner had been studying in Germany during the sixties. He was tutor at Yale from 1866 to 1869. Then for three years he was assistant director of an Episcopal church in New York City; later, a rector of a large church. From 1872 until his death in 1910 he was Professor of Political and Social Science at Yale. Unfortunately for the students of sociology in the United States, before his death Sumner did not publish more than two books in this field. His earliest, entitled, *What Social Classes Owe Each Other*, was published in 1883, and from the standpoint of sociology is quite unimportant. In 1906, however, he published his *Folkways*, a book of the highest significance. It is to be regretted that the proposed textbook of sociology, which, he says in the preface to *Folkways*, he began to write in 1899, was never finished. From his *Folkways* one gets the impression that here was a man of first-rate qualities who allowed his energies to be diverted into other lines and thus failed to give to America a rounded view of his conception of sociology. What his proposed work on the science of society, or sociology, was like we shall have to wait

to discover until its possible publication by his colleague and successor, Professor Keller. Anyone acquainted with his *Folkways* will look forward to it with a great deal of interest. His recently published essays, aside from the few which he had worked out as chapters for his *Folkways* and had to omit, probably give us an inadequate notion of what his proposed Science of Society would be like. Most of his essays on sociology were devoted to attacks on what he considered the vagaries of sociology. The one outstanding illustration of his method is to be seen in the material which he prepared for his *Folkways*. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the development of sociology in this country was his emphasis upon the scientific method. That emphasis he was constantly reiterating.

Albion W. Small, another of the American sociological pioneers, came to sociology through a different experience. After graduating from college he entered the Newton Theological Institute, where his already keen appetite for learning was further whetted, and where he formed the determination to spend several years in Germany and England in the study of history and political economy. At Berlin and at Leipzig he came in contact with the new intellectual ferment of the German historians and political economists. Having married in Germany, he returned home and accepted a position at professor of History and Political Economy in Colby University, from which he had graduated. His studies with Schmoller had awakened his interest in the conflict of classes and the interests which move various classes in their attempts to secure the satisfaction of their wants. In the meantime he had become acquainted with the writers on sociology in France and Great Britain and tried to find some place in this country where graduate instruction in sociology was given. Finally, through the influence of a graduate of the Johns Hopkins University who was a friend of his, and through the influence of one of the early books of Professor Richard T. Ely which was put into his hands, he went to the Johns Hopkins University on a year's leave of absence from Colby, and there entered the atmosphere of that stimulating group of teachers and graduate students. On his return to Colby he was elected President of the institution and introduced a course of sociology, at the same time providing a syllabus called "An Introduction to the Science of Sociology," prepared by himself for his students. During the entire period of his life at Chicago Small contributed steadily to the development of sociological thought in this country.

Within the limits of this paper it is impossible to trace the development of his thought. It must suffice to notice that his chief contributions were: (1) His theory of social forces to be found in the interests. These interests he formulated as those of health, wealth, sociability, knowledge, beauty, and rightness. This theory of interests shows his indebtedness to his German experience. (2) Perhaps Small's most important contribution to American sociology was his interpretation of Ratzenhofer to American sociologists. (3) During the latter part of his life Professor Small was interested in what he called methodology. While, like Sumner and Giddings, he emphasized the necessity of building sociology as a basis of facts, what he really meant by methodology was the working out of such categories as he thought would give significance to the facts found. His best work on methodology was the comparative study of the works of Spencer, Schaeffle, and Ratzenhofer. He pointed out that the

chief trend in sociology from Spencer to Ratzenhofer was from structure to process, or, as he put it, "gradual shifting of effort from analogical representation of social structures to real analysis of social processes." (4) In striking contrast to Sumner, Small was led by his study of conflict between groups to the conception that conflict is resolved through mutual co-operation and socialized control. This theory provided Small a method for his emphasis upon ethics in sociology. He is not interested in sociology except as it contributes to social betterment. His analysis enabled him to sympathize with Adam Smith and Lester F. Ward rather than with Spencer and Sumner. It provided him with a basis for social ethics which he had not found in his philosophical studies. Doubtless the roots of this interest are to be found in his study of Schmoller and Sombart. Its clearest expression is to be found in his little known book, *Between Eras*. (5) Perhaps Small has contributed to the history of sociology more than any other American sociologist. His monograph "Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States," published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in May, 1916, and his address, "The Future of Sociology," in the publications of the *American Sociological Society* for 1920, and his last book, *Origins of Sociology*, give us not only the best sketch we possess of the development of sociology in this country, but also the European background out of which it grew, especially in Germany.

Another American sociological pioneer was Franklin Henry Giddings, who gave his first course on sociology at Bryn Mawr in 1890. His background was somewhat different from that of either Sumner or Small. Like Sumner and Small, he early became acquainted with the writings of Herbert Spencer and the English evolutionary scientists. Later the writings of the continental sociologists, Comte, Schaeffle, Lilienfeld, Roberty, and De Greef, all played their part in the formation of his sociological ideas. Unlike Sumner and Small, he was denied the benefits of a European experience early in his career. On the other hand, however, he obtained a splendid preparation for his future work in his ten years' experience as a journalist from cub reporter to manager. Moreover, in the early days of the American Economic Association he was active in its work, for a time being the editor of its publications. Even as a journalist he manifested great interest in practical economic problems in Massachusetts, having made a study of profit-sharing in Massachusetts which at the time was recognized as so thoroughly done that no further attempt at investigation of the subject was felt necessary. Likewise, his sociological interests led him to suggest modification in the current political philosophy of his day. His acquaintance with Mill's *Logic* and Lewes's *Problems of Life and Mind* were of primary importance in his analysis of social processes.

What, briefly, have been his contributions to American sociology? (1) More thoroughly than anyone else, except Sumner, he has been a Spencerian in his philosophy. He was, however, much more influenced by Ward and the more recent psychological writers than Sumner. He was not as thoroughly convinced as Sumner of the infallibility of classical economics. Nevertheless there appears in his sociology a rather decided impatience with those who would endeavor to modify social arrangements without reference to the sociological and psychological factors which condition social change.

(2) Giddings' early association with Richmond Mayo-Smith at Columbia gave him an appreciation of the importance of quantitative measurements of social phenomena possessed by none of the other American sociological pioneers. It is to be seen in his *Inductive Sociology*, in his address before the American Sociological Society, entitled "The Social Marking System," and in his latest book, *The Scientific Study of Human Society*. Incessantly he has emphasized the importance of quantitative measurements in sociology. The difficulties of such measurements have not deterred him from attempting to apply his own theories. However imperfect have been his attempts to apply this method to sociological phenomena, they do not detract in the least from the great importance of this contribution to early American sociology. (3) Another important contribution of Giddings to the early development of sociology in this country was his analysis of sociological phenomena. Whatever later scholars may think of his analysis, no one has approached him in his rigid and minute logical classification. (4) None of our pioneers except Sumner and Thomas have made such use of anthropological and ethnological materials for sociology as has Giddings. His picture of historical evolution, which of course must be corrected by the newer anthropological researches, together with Sumner's *Folkways*, tended to bring sociology in the United States and anthropology into close and intimate relations. Doubtless much of this impetus was given him by Spencer. It shares the defects of Spencer's methods, but served to balance with concreteness the rather abstract logical analysis in his systematic sociology. (5) Early Giddings enriched the American conception of social forces by his formula of "consciousness of kind." Later, when he came into contact with the pragmatic philosophy of William James and modern dynamic psychology, Giddings provided a theory for the interpretation of social evolution through the employment of "consciousness of kind," "physical and social pressures," and "pluralistic behavior" which finally furnished him his formula to explain the origin and development of social phenomena. The latest formulation of his theory of sociology is as follows:

1. A situation of stimulus is reacted to by more than one individual there is pluralistic as well as singularistic behavior. Pluralistic behavior develops into rivalries, competitions, and conflicts, and also, into agreements, contracts, and collective enterprises. Therefore social phenomena are products of two variables, namely, situation (in the psychologist's definition of the word) and pluralistic behavior.
2. When the individuals who participate in pluralistic behavior have become differentiated into behavioristic kinds or types, a consciousness of kind, liking or disliking, approving or disapproving one kind after another, converts gregariousness into a consciously discriminative association, herd habit into society; and society, by a social pressure which sometimes is conscious but more often, perhaps, is unconscious, makes life relatively hard for kinds of character and conduct that are disapproved.
3. Society organizes itself for collective endeavor and achievement, if fundamental similarities of behavior and an awareness of them are extensive enough to maintain social cohesion, while differences of behavior and awareness of them in matters of detail are sufficient to create a division of labor.
4. In the long run organized society by its approvals and disapprovals, its pressures and achievements, selects and perpetuates the types of mind and character

that are relatively intelligent, tolerant, and helpful, that exhibit initiative, that bear their share of responsibility and that effectively play their part in collective enterprise. It selects and perpetuates the adequate.⁴

(6) No man since Spencer among the sociologists has brought under tribute for sociology so much of contemporary philosophy, science, and history. The range of his reading has been unusually wide, as revealed by all his writings. His systematic mind could not be content until this knowledge was given a place in his social philosophy. Whatever we may think of his system, there is no doubt that it was made in full view of a very large part of modern knowledge.

As another example of the early American sociologists, take Ross. Trained as an economist in the University of Berlin and the Johns Hopkins University, he felt the new spirit in German economics, history, and political science. More largely than any of the other pioneers we have discussed, Ross was influenced early by Lester F. Ward. More than any of the others he was also influenced by Gabriel Tarde.

What have been some of his outstanding contributions to American sociology? (1) Ross's interest in language early in his life was so keen that he once thought of being a philologist. Striking phrase and statement have characterized his work in sociology. It can be said of him without dispute that he has made sociology popular. A professor of English at one of our universities once remarked that he read each new book of Ross's as it came off for its English. No one has done more than Ross to make sociology readable. (2) When one thinks of social psychology in America he inevitably thinks of Ross. His *Social Control* is one of the most important contributions to social psychology. In that book with master hand he exposed the processes by which society, through psychological devices, controls and directs the activities of man. While it has become necessary further to refine the analysis, and while the methods of study of group psychology are rapidly changing, Ross's contribution will remain as one of the important developments of American sociology. (3) Ross has been unique among American pioneer sociologists in making first-hand studies of the social life of various peoples scattered over the earth. History will have to determine the value of his methods. There can be no question, however, that a sociologist visiting various parts of the world and endeavoring by some method to study the social institutions and attitudes of a people quite different from our own is a new thing under the sun. Instead of depending upon the written accounts of other observers, Ross has contended that a sociologist should see these peoples in their native haunts and describe their life, their institutions, and their social psychology. In doing this Ross has pursued what Spengler has called the history method rather than the nature method. (4) Ross's sociology is characterized by hospitality to the ideas of other sociologists, rare among our pioneers. In contrast with the rigid laissez-faireism of Sumner and the rigidly logical system of Giddings based upon the doctrine of "consciousness of kind," and in striking distinction to Small's theory of sociology based upon the interests, Ross has offered hospitable reception to all of these and

⁴ Giddings, *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, pp. 291-92.

many other ideas. His system is less logical and more descriptive. No one has analyzed the social processes so minutely as Ross. Out of something more than 700 pages in his *Principles of Sociology*, over 500 are devoted to social processes. He rides no sociological hobby, by reason of the fact that he sees the multiplicity of factors in the situation. Breadth of vision and hospitality to ideas characterize his work.

This brief survey of American sociological pioneers must include Charles Horton Cooley. Son of the famous Michigan jurist and teacher of law, Thomas M. Cooley, Professor Cooley has been the product academically of the University of Michigan. Like most of the others we have surveyed, he came to sociology through economics. Influenced profoundly by William James and Mark Baldwin, Professor Cooley's sociology has the distinctly psychological trend. However, he has been no mere slave of these masters. Their ideas have been transformed by the subtle alchemy of his mind into new products for sociology phrased with a beauty and charm and penetrated with unusual insight.

Professor Cooley's contributions to sociology may be summarized as follows: (1) No man among our pioneers has brought such an understanding of literature to the illumination of sociological interpretation. The Greek myth and the Greek poetry, the great classics of the whole Western World, are laid under tribute to illustrate his sociological conceptions. Painting, sculpture, architecture — in short, all the aesthetic arts — play through Cooley's sociological writings like sunlight through breaking clouds. (2) Cooley contributed to sociology an explanation of the play of circumstance upon the developing child which gives us a conception of the influence of social life upon the making of personality, which, while based upon James and Baldwin, is unique in its penetrating insight. His *Human Nature and the Social Order* easily stands preeminent in the analysis of the social factors in the making of the individual mind and personality. (3) In his second book, *Social Organization*, Cooley contributes his doctrines of the primary groups—family, playground, and neighborhood—in which occur the chief processes of socialization. In these groups human nature is formed. Out of them grow what he calls our primary ideals. Stretching out from them in ever widening circles are the less potent influences in groups which form and fashion us and make us personalities. (4) Cooley is pre-eminently the representative of another trend in American sociology. Living in the midst of a movement which we call scientific and which has achieved its success in the physical sciences, Cooley has stated most clearly the conception of sociological methodology to which Small had given some attention. He points out with great clearness the importance of not only statistics as a method of sociological research, but the importance of coupling therewith an interpretive spirit based upon a broad human culture in philosophy, literature, and art. While this appears in all his books, its best expression is to be found in his article entitled "The Roots of Social Knowledge" in the *American Journal of Sociology* for July, 1926. He doubts the validity of the statistical method in sociology when used alone. Some things which can be understood by other methods and which cannot be measured by statistics, he asserts, must be taken into consideration in any interpretation of society. He holds that you must use both methods if you would arrive at truth. This trend in American sociology must not be

misunderstood or underrated. (5) None of our American sociological pioneers have a system which so easily makes a place for what we usually call social pathology. Cooley's analysis makes necessary consideration of the abnormal in social relationships. He is interested in answering the question as to how social personality is developed. His observation took in the degenerate as well as the normal personality in society. His method of interpreting the normal availed to understand the abnormal. Social degeneration as well as normal society receives due attention in Cooley's thought as in no other. In the face of the historical opposition in American sociology between sociological theory and social work this attitude is of the greatest significance.

Attention must be given to one other important pioneer, William I. Thomas. Thomas was one of the protégés of Dr. Small at the newly established University of Chicago. He made his reputation in social psychology. For the sake of brevity I shall not survey the development of his ideas, but point out as briefly as I can the significant trend which he introduced into American sociology, especially into social psychology. In passing I may remark that he shared with Sumner and Giddings an interest in what the study of primitive peoples could provide for sociology, as shown by his important book, *Source Book of Social Origins*. In this book he showed how the study of primitive society can illuminate not only social structure, but also social process and social psychology.

Two outstanding contributions are to his credit: (1) Perhaps influenced by Havelock Ellis' studies in the psychology of sex, he showed for the first time in American sociology the importance of sex in its relationship to social forms, social ideals, social attitudes. (2) More significant for sociology and social psychology is his contribution to methodology in his study of *The Polish Peasant*. Here, through case studies of immigrants to this country he revealed the changes involved in going from one social complex to another. He studied the shock which comes to some individuals who change suddenly from a society with one set of ideals, attitudes, and customs to another. He showed the processes by which readjustment takes place, or, if they fail to occur, the consequences of this sudden change. He enabled us to understand how demoralization occurs in this uprooting of family and individual from one kind of social soil and planting it down in another kind. (3) This method also, but in another way than that employed by Cooley, reconciles sociology and social work. Here sociology has shown what light can be thrown upon the problems of social work by providing an understanding of the essential factors in the case.

Summarizing the tendencies in American sociology in its early years, we may see the following characteristics: (1) It attempted to define the scope of its field. (2) It groped after a methodology. (3) It tried to define its relationship to the other social sciences. (4) An analysis of social classes, social institutions, and social processes began to take form. (5) An attempt was made to show how it evolved. (6) Sociologists tentatively analyzed the nature of the social process. (7) The nature of social forces was studied. (8) The meaning of progress was defined. (9) Early a social philosophy, sociology later placed more emphasis upon the application of quantitative

measurements to its phenomena, thus attempting to bring it in line in its methodology with the natural sciences. (10) In trying to work out a theory of how social groups were formed, how they became differentiated, and how to account for group conflict and accommodation, a social psychology was originated which worked itself out among some of our pioneers as an analysis of social process. (11) In facing the problem of maladjusted individuals and groups, a theory of social pathology appears, sometimes, as with Giddings, partly on a biological and partly on a sociological basis, or, as with Cooley and Thomas, according to the principles of social psychology. (12) From the standpoint of social evolution it found its most fruitful material in the results of social anthropology.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY SINCE THE PIONEERS

The distinction which I have made in this study is artificial, since some of the pioneers whom I have named are still living and their thought has continued to grow. Sumner, Small, and Ward are gone, but Giddings, Ross, Cooley, and Thomas are still active and creative. Nevertheless, as one looks over the field of sociology in the United States and studies rather carefully the productions of later men, he cannot fail to be impressed with the multiplicity and diversity of points of view in sociology in recent years. Did time permit it would be worth while to give an exposition of the development of each of the more recent writers. It must suffice, however, to point out in broad outline the general development.

One thing which strikes the surveyor of the field of sociology in recent years in the United States is the way in which different sociologists have approached the problems according as they were influenced by this science or another. For example, those who have been trained in psychology have shown a tendency to approach the problem of sociology from that standpoint. Others have been impressed with the importance of geographic factors, while still others have been influenced in their point of view by biology. The anthropological sociologists have been with us from the beginning. Others approach the matter from the standpoint of social pathology, and some are still determined in their treatment by their studies in philosophy. This situation creates a bewilderment to one unfamiliar with the history of sociology, and has caused many of the enemies of the Lord to rejoice. The situation is clear evidence that sociology is still in its formative stage and that much still remains to make it a science.

However, out of this confusion of tongues some lines of tendency have begun to appear. (1) The chaos is not as great as it appears at first sight. The work of these various specialists, each approaching the problem of sociology from his own point of interest, has had the effect of bringing above the horizon of consciousness for us all certain factors which we ourselves perhaps otherwise would have neglected. (2) It has begun to be clear that sociology must build upon the materials furnished it by other sciences which affect social relationships and social groups just as psychology must build upon physiology. Any science which can throw light upon how groups are formed, what ties bind men together and what separate them, why certain people fail

to adjust themselves to the social relationships which have been established by groups, what factors revealed in whatever field of knowledge have influenced the formation, re-formation, and decadence of social structures the sociologist may lay under tribute. (3) It has begun to be clear, however, that sociology must define its problems and attack them by its own methods. The social survey, the census, case studies of communities and of individuals are indications of this tendency. Just as biology, in spite of the fact that it never forgets its fundamental sciences of physics and chemistry, and takes into account whatever these sciences can contribute to an understanding of its problems, nevertheless has its own field and its own problems, and attacks them by its own methods, so sociology, while fully conscious of its dependence upon geography, biology, even physiological chemistry, psychology, and anthropology, has its particular problems and attempts to understand them by its own methods. The statistical method is common to all these sciences. Sociology is using it more and more in an endeavor to study quantitatively those elements in its problems which are subject to statistical measurement and interpretation. There are certain problems in sociology, however, as in psychology and biology, to which the statistical method has not yet been successfully applied. We have not yet succeeded in measuring the comparative influence of different social factors in the production of certain group reactions. Nevertheless, through the study of instances and cases it is possible to get some light upon the motives moving masses of men in certain directions and some indication of the conflicting emotions and motives which in a given situation account for certain otherwise unexpected results. (4) It is usually assumed that sociology is not an experimental science. It is said that we cannot coop up groups of human individuals in a laboratory and vary the conditions of their existence in order that we may know how they will react under different conditions. That is true as far as it goes. However, we should not be blind to the fact that great social experiments are constantly going on. Scientifically, the difficulty is in the control. That it is not impossible, however, is indicated by the attempt to study groups of delinquents and groups of non-delinquents, but with different or the same social surroundings and with the same or different heredity. In the field of education and social legislation experiments that certainly have value for human society are constantly being tried. The changes in our school system, in methods of teaching, etc., the different methods used in advertising, in caring for the dependent, in handling prisoners, and in rehabilitating demoralized families, provide an experimental basis for sociology. Social legislation provides a rich field for sociological study. In the field of social pathology new methods are constantly being tried. Statistical treatment of the results is quite possible and in some cases is being carried out to great advantage. Just as in the physical sciences, hypotheses to explain what is found by experiment and by statistical treatment are necessary. In general I think it can be said, therefore, that sociology, in spite of its complexity and the difficulty of applying scientific controls to the study of its phenomena, has arrived at certain definite conclusions, which, while tentative and awaiting further investigations, do throw light upon practical problems. It may be said, however, that its tentative conclusions are no more tentative than some of those in the natural sciences. (5) Recently a tendency has appeared, such as emerged long ago in the physical sciences, to abandon armchair generalizations, and for each sociologist to select what seems to

him to be a promising and important problem and endeavor to study it by the best scientific methods which he can devise. Thus, Park and Burgess have set themselves the problem of urban sociology, specifically the problem of understanding what occurs in urban life, Ross has devoted himself recently to a careful study of population, and numerous scholars are addressing themselves to the problems that arise in connection with our pathological classes. The first task seems to be to describe what we see, leaving generalization to a later time when we have a sufficient body of facts on which we can safely generalize, but at the same time suggesting hypotheses to explain the phenomena observed. The predominant note in this tendency is research, and by research the sociologists mean studying a given social problem or phase of human relationship by all the scientific methods now known and any others which may be devised. Where quantitative measurements can be employed they are being used. Where statistics is too clumsy a method to measure the facts we want, such as the subtle interplay of emotional and mental activities in relation to conduct, we shall have to be satisfied with a study of the mechanics by which certain social results come about in a concrete case. Woolston's studies of overpopulation are illustrations of the former, while Thomas' studies of the Polish peasant and the unadjusted girl show us the possibilities of the latter. (6) Small for many years urged that the water-tight compartments of the social sciences should be abandoned, that in the study of social relationships we have to take into account all sorts of factors and influences. In the physical sciences this suggestion has been operating for some time. In studying bird life, for example, in any area it is necessary to take into account not only the biological factors but the geographic and even the social, since it has been found that bird life varies with physiographic features, with temperature, with altitude, and also with the presence or absence of mankind. The most promising development along this line in recent years in the social sciences has been the organization of the Social Science Research Council. It is based upon the recognition of the interdependency of the various social sciences in the study of numerous social problems. The study of human migration, of the mechanization of industry, of pioneer belts, of prohibition, and of crime require the work, not only of sociologists or economists or political scientists or anthropologists, but of all of them. Moreover, this Council has recognized that not only one method must be employed, but every method which will throw light upon the problem. The strictest canons of scientific criticism and caution, it has been recognized, must be employed. This tendency marks the beginning of co-operative effort in the social sciences. There are so many facets to human experience and social relationship that no one specialist can see them all. As a corollary to this tendency sociology as social philosophy is enlarged to sociology as social science. (7) The trend in social psychology is equally striking and important. In American social psychology we have had four great systems or tendencies: (a) the social-mind theory, typified by Giddings, Ross, and Ellwood; (b) the social-instincts theory, represented by Professor McDougall; (c) the social attitude and social habit tendency, represented by Thomas and Dewey; and (d) the personality and society theory, perhaps typified best by Professor Cooley. A number of other scholars have of course contributed to each of these tendencies in social psychology. Each of these schools of thought has had its adherents and has helped in the clarification of the problem. Perhaps the most outstanding tendency of the present

time is a kind of synthesis and simplification of these various theories and the emergence of a fifth tendency which takes account of the mechanisms revealed by psychology, but brings to the consideration, as individual psychology often does not, the interplay between developing personality and the surrounding situation. As Professor Young has phrased the new tendency, "Social psychology is the study of the personality as affected by social and institutional stimuli, and as in turn affecting these." This tendency, while not accepting fully the Freudian analysis, finds suggestions here which help to explain the mechanism of the interplay between personality and social environment. Here, as in general sociology, there is a tendency to stress the need of more research as to the effect produced on the individual personality as shown by his attitude toward others by what has been called the social frames of behavior laid down by others. The most hopeful thing is that in social psychology it is now being recognized that we need carefully observed and recorded objective data of the interplay between persons and institutions. What social psychology seems to be about is the endeavor to understand how the individual becomes socialized, i.e., conformed to the frames of conduct coming down from the past through tradition and custom, and how in turn the individual affects changes in these institutions and customs. The method now recognized is careful scientific research, especially on the social side. Anthropology's study of culture patterns and their influences upon individuals is here of the greatest importance.

THE RELATION BETWEEN SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK

Sociology in the United States had two roots. One of these was European study of political economy and political science already noted. The other was interest in what we call now social pathology, once known as charities and corrections. The recent tendencies, however, in general sociology and in social psychology have provided a bridge over this gulf. The recent emphasis upon research with the endeavor to study objectively specific social problems, the emphasis in social psychology upon processes in the formation of social personality, and an endeavor to trace the disintegration of personality and group bring into proper perspective again the pathological individual and the pathological group. One cannot study the interrelation of the person with his inherited tendencies, and the environment that plays upon him, and, in turn the influence of this personality upon groups with which he associates without emphasizing not only the process by which the socialized personality is formed but also how the disorganized personality and group come into being. In nature these two things occur together. It is a hopeful tendency in the study of sociology at the present time that they are being studied together as they occur. Personality and its social products further adjusted to the social environment in which it lives, or disorganized in the sense that it is not adjusted to its environment, is seen to be a function of variables in the individual and in the environment. It is thus becoming apparent that what nature has placed together even a sociologist must not put asunder.

The converse of this is also true. While for many years the social workers have gone their own way without reference to the light cast upon their problems by sociology

and social psychology, they are now coming to see that in the work of reorganizing individual personalities they must take into account racial and cultural backgrounds, the psychology and the psychopathology of individuals, the inherited tendencies of individuals, the culture patterns of the group in the midst of which they have been born and have grown up, if they are to attack the problem of the disorganized personality with any hope of success.

SOCIOLOGY AS A UNIVERSITY SUBJECT

I take for granted your acquaintance with Tolman's articles on the study of sociology in the United States in Vols. VII and VIII of the *American Journal of Sociology*. In the twenty-five years since these articles were written some few changes have taken place in the number of institutions in which sociology is taught. Greater changes have taken place in the nature and content of the course as well as the methods of teaching.

Perhaps the most significant tendencies in the teaching of sociology in the United States at the present time are: (1) The increase in the number of courses under the title of sociology. Instead of the social science of the early nineties, by which term was meant chiefly charities and social reform and a course in theoretical sociology based upon Ward or Spencer, a rich variety of courses both graduate and undergraduate, now appear in the catalogues of most universities where sociology has been established for some time. This enrichment has come about by recognition of the close relationships of sociology with other sciences, giving rise to such courses as the Physical Basis of Society, Social Geography, Social Psychology, Human Ecology, Urban Sociology, and Rural Sociology. Specialization has also appeared in the field of social pathology, giving rise to courses upon the dependent classes and others upon the criminal classes, and unadjusted child or child problems, the family, social adjustment, and courses in case work. (2) With the attempt to apply scientific methods to the study of objective phenomena in connection with social relationships a number of courses have been developed to study, by statistics or through the study of cases definite sociological problems. The social survey which has been introduced in some institutions represents one method. (3) As sociology has grown older, inevitably there emerged a tendency to introduce courses on the history of various phases of sociology. Hence we have courses on the history of social thought, on the history of philanthropy, and on the history of penology. (4) As the result of increasing recognition of the close relationships between anthropology and sociology, in a number of universities, courses in cultural anthropology, courses on primitive society and on social origins have been established in either the department of sociology or in a department closely allied with sociology. (5) Recently there has appeared a recognition of the close relationships between sociology and education, which has given rise to course in educational sociology either in the department of sociology or in the department of education. (6) Just recently a tendency has appeared which recognizes the close relationship between religion and sociology, giving rise to courses in the sociology of religion.

In spite of the rather rapid expansion of sociology as a college and university subject, it must be frankly admitted that there are a number of institutions which do not recognize the subject by this name. While some of them are teaching what is usually called sociology in other institutions under some other name, such as social economy or social science, thus recognizing that there is a body of material which deserves to be studied and which was not covered by the older social studies, nevertheless the fact that they do not call it sociology registers the feeling in some quarters that the term "sociology" has a bad connotation. A recent inquiry by Professor Odum of the University of North Carolina has shown that the objection to the term is partly due to the fact that it is often misunderstood as something like, if not the same, as socialism, and partly to the objection of scholars to what they think is the historical content of sociology. Sometimes the explanation given as to why the subject is not called sociology in a given institution is that the subject was started under another name in an earlier time and it has not been found necessary or convenient to change the title of the department.

Viewing the history of sociology in the United States impartially, one can see some reasons for the objection to the use of the term. Doubtless the similarity of sound between the two words, "sociology" and "socialism," the ill odor in which socialism has been held among our scholars, and the lack of discrimination by the common man have given some reason in certain quarters of the country for the unwillingness to introduce the term. In certain of our institutions it has unfortunately been true that sociology has been advocated by men who had no adequate understanding of scholarship. In their hands it was a mass of undigested, unsystematized, unscrutinized generalities which made a popular appeal to sophomores and attendants at chautauquas. They mouthed loudly of science but really had neither part nor lot in the matter. Flamboyant propaganda and silly sentimentalism made up the major portion of such sociology. It consisted largely of what they thought ought to be done with a minimum of fact as to the picture of the exact situation or a rigid comparative study of human experience. While some of these, unfortunately, are still with us, the application of the scientific method and the increasing emphasis upon objective data have been acting as selective agents in consigning these enemies of sociology to a deserved innocuous desuetude. Doubtless we shall have to put up with some of them longer, inasmuch as there is no sociological orthodoxy and no sociological inquisition or holy office by which these fellows can be eliminated. Emphasis upon rigidly scientific methods will attend to them. Nevertheless the objection to sociology by sane, sensible men should give serious sociologists food for thought and help them to sounder methods of teaching and research.

In looking back thus briefly over the history of sociology in the United States, we see much to keep us humble and something to encourage us. Its progress has been as rapid as anyone had any right to expect, and in some cases more rapid than was good for the subject.

A solid basis has been obtained in anthropology and ethnology for the history of society. The outlines of the origins of social institutions, social ideas, customs,

traditions, etc., have been fairly well made out. The study of the fossil remains of present-day social survivals has been of as great value to sociology, as the study of fossil remains of former generations of life has been to biology. Again, real progress has been made in assimilating the results of kindred sciences upon which sociology rests, such as psychology, biology, eugenics, and geography. By slow but certain steps, with numerous windings into by-paths and with frequent retracing of steps, sociology has gone its way. In spite of false steps and frequent stumblings sociology has gone on toward an understanding of a field neglected but vital. It proceeds on the hypothesis that it is possible to explore and understand social reality, the processes by which human relationships are formed and disintegrate. It proceeds in the faith that the formation and change of social institutions can be understood. It believes that it is possible to discover generalizations concerning human action under varying conditions. It proposes to borrow, invent, and apply methods by which to discover the truth concerning social movement, social inertia, and social change. By its works — both as to method and results — it stands or falls. So far as we can see at present, it will be judged by the willingness of its devotees to face courageously the drudgery, the loneliness, the sneers, and the patience inevitable in the path toward its goal. Its method is patient research, hypothesis carefully tested, and cautious interpretation; its glory, the satisfaction of understanding human relationships and of helping thus to build a better world-society.

Originally published in:
Papers and Proceedings
Twenty-First Annual Meeting
American Sociological Society
Held at St. Louis
December 28-31, 1926

Volume XXI
"The Progress of Sociology"

Copyright 1927 by The American Sociological Society