UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150765

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—67—11-1-68—5,000.

1505

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 301/E47S Accession No. P.G. 1868

Author

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

SOCIOLOGY

PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, PH.D., LL.D.

Professor of Sociology, Duke University. Author of "The Psychology of Human Society," "The Social Problem," "The Reconstruction of Religion," "Man's Social Destiny in the Light of Science," "A History of Social Philosophy"

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON
ATLANTA DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO

SOCIOLOGY: PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS

Copyright, 1943, by
AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND SOCIOLOGY

Copyright, 1935, by American Book Company

SOCIAL PROBLEMS: A SOCIOLOGY

Copyright, 1932, 1934, by American Book Company

SOCIOLOGY AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Copyright, 1910, 1913, 1919, 1938, by Charles A. Ellwood

Copyright, 1924, by American Book Company

No part of this book protected by the above copyrights may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publisher.

E. P. 1

MADE IN U. S. A.

PREFACE FOR TEACHERS

THIS introductory text in sociology has been written with the conviction that the best method of understanding sociological principles for elementary students is through the study of the concrete situations and problems of contemporary social life; through the study of the familiar rather than the unfamiliar. The problems have been selected mainly from contemporary American society, not merely because these are of practical value in training for citizenship, but also because the United States affords, for American students at least, the greatest sociological laboratory that can possibly be found. Therefore, while this book emphasizes the problem approach to sociology through the observation, description, and statistical study of contemporary society, the historical and psychological approaches to these problems have also been utilized, all to the ultimate end of driving home and fixing principles.

Emphasis in sociology is rightly increasingly placed upon our civilization, or "culture," as the main factor in producing present-day problems in human relations. But our civilization is itself a product of human history, and ultimately of the human mind working to control both the forces of nature and human relations. The origin of all patterns of human social behavior must accordingly be sought in the simplest and most primitive forms of human association. These are the face-to-face groups of men.

Hence the book emphasizes the fact that the study of human society must begin with the study of "primary" or face-to-face groups. This is in line with the soundest trend of scientific sociology. It is generally recognized that the study of human social behavior should begin with the study of these primary groups. This means that we must begin with either the family group or the neighborhood group.

For reasons pointed out in the text, the family group seems to be the more natural and more suitable group with which to begin the study of human society. The book aims, first of all, therefore, to illustrate the working of the chief factors in social organization and evolution, and so the elementary principles of sociology, by the study of the origin, development, structure, and functions of the family considered as a typical human institution. The family is the simplest and in many ways the most typical form of human association. While there are many things in human association which the student cannot perceive through the study of the family, yet it does reveal in a most unmistakable way the fundamental biological and psychological factors in human social life.

The teacher is, therefore, recommended to encourage students to study their individual families and their neighborhoods. The history of families through several generations is a form of sociological investigation, or of "case study," well suited to elementary students because such study will bring out clearly the biological, psychological, and cultural factors affecting human social life. Attention should be paid especially to the interests, ideals, and traditions of families. To the same end, monographs or surveys of communities and neighborhoods may be prepared. Thus the making of one or more family monographs, together with the making of one or more community or neighborhood surveys, may well be made the necessary laboratory or field work in an elementary course of sociology in connection with the study of this text. References for the making of such surveys and monographs will be found at the end of Chapter IV.

Those teachers who desire parallel readings will find an abundance of references at the ends of chapters. The references placed under the heading, "For brief reading," are especially commended, and might form the nucleus of a small working sociological library. Those who use the book in colleges to start students in the field of sociology will find a fuller development of the same theoretical point of view in my *Psychology of Human Society: An Introduction to Sociological Theory*, published by the Appleton-Century Company.

This book is the latest revision and enlargement of the text first published under the title "Sociology and Modern Social Problems," with later editions called "Social Problems: A Sociology" and "Social Problems and Sociology:" While the general plan of the book has not been changed, it has been thoroughly revised to incorporate the latest scientific knowledge concerning human relations, and the results of the Federal Census of 1940, so far as these have been published; and a new chapter on The Rural Problem has been included. An enlarged Glossary of scientific terms is placed at the end of the book, just preceding the Index. The lists of Select References at the ends of chapters have been thoroughly revised, and enlarged by the addition of recent publications; and finally, at the end of each chapter new Suggested Activities, mostly Questions, can be used to any desired extent.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Study of Society	3
II.	The Bearing of the Theory of Evolution upon Social Problems	24
III.	The Bearing of Modern Psychology upon Social Problems	52
IV.	Primary Groups: the Function of the Family in Human Society	75
V.	The Origin of the Family	90
VI.	The Forms of the Family	104
VII.	The Historical Development of the Family	122
VIII.	The Problem of the Modern Family	134
IX.	The Growth of Population	164
X.	The Intermingling of Peoples	191
XI.	The Intermingling of Races	218
XII.	The Growth of Cities	244
XIII.	The Rural Problem	265

Chapter Page

XIV. Poverty and Pauperism 283

XV. Crime 314

XVI. Marxian Socialism in the Light of Sociology . . 344

XVII. Education and Social Progress 360

XVIII. Theoretical Summary 374

Glossary 395

Index 401

SOCIOLOGY

PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF SOCIETY

What is Society?—One great question which the science of sociology seeks to answer is the question which is put at the beginning of this first paragraph. Just as biology seeks to answer the question "What is life?"; zoölogy, "What is an animal?"; and botany, "What is a plant?"; so sociology seeks to answer the question "What is society?" But just as biology, zoölogy, and botany cannot answer their questions until those sciences have reached their complete development, so also sociology cannot fully answer the question "What is society?" until it reaches its final development. Nevertheless, some conception or definition of society is necessary for the beginner; for in the scientific discussion of any problem we must know first of all what we are talking about. Before we can study the social problems of to-day from a sociological point of view, then, we must understand in a general way what society is, what sociology is, and what the relations are between sociology and other sciences.

The word "society" is used popularly to designate a variety of more or less permanent human groups. A word used scientifically, however, must be given a definite meaning corresponding to observed facts. Now we observe in the first place that collective or group life is not peculiar to man, but characterizes many animals and plants as well. Mere collective or group life, however, is not in itself social life. A clump of grasses, a forest of trees, a colony of bacteria, or a group of protozoa may show interdependence in the life activities of their separate units, but they are not usually called "societies," because, so far as is known, their individuals do not have conscious relations. Such groups of lowly organisms do, however, show the first mark of social life in that they carry on certain life activities

in common. But interdependence in life activities constitutes what is called "comradeship" or "society" only when it reaches the conscious or mental plane.

The second mark of social life, accordingly, is the existence of conscious relations among the members of a group. The group life is carried on by means of mental interactions; that is, the interdependence in life activities is more or less guided and controlled by conscious processes. Using the term "society" in a concrete sense, then, we find that *a society is any group of individuals who carry on a common life by means of conscious interactions.* It is not necessary that these "conscious interactions" be specialized into imitative or sympathetic, economic or political interactions to make society or social life. Society is constituted by the mental interaction of individuals, and exists wherever two or more individuals have reciprocal conscious relations to each other. Dependence upon a common economic environment, or mere contiguity in space, on the other hand, is not sufficient to constitute society. It is mental interaction, the interstimulation and mutual adjustment of our inner selves, which makes possible that form of collective life which is called "society." Groups of plants do not constitute true societies unless it can be shown that they have some degree of mental life. On the other hand, there is no reason for withholding the term society from many animal groups. These "animal societies," however, are very different from human society, and are of interest to us only as certain of their forms throw light upon human society.

Certain faulty conceptions of society are prevalent, against which the beginner must be warned. In the writings of European sociologists the word "society" is often used as nearly synonymous with the state or nation. Now the state or nation is a group of people politically organized into an independent government, and it is only one of many forms of human society. To identify society with the state leads to many errors, both in theory and in practice. Another conception of society would make it synonymous with the cultural group or civilization. A society, according to this conception, is any

group of people that have a common civilization, or that are bearers of a certain type of culture. Christendom, for example, would constitute a society. But cultural groups again are only one form of human society. Nations and civilizations are very imposing forms of human society, and hence they have attracted the attention of social thinkers in the past to the neglect of the more humble forms.

Any social group, if studied from the point of view of organization and development, whether it be a family, a neighborhood group, a city, a nation, a party, or a trade union, will serve to reveal many of the problems of sociology. All social groups are of interest to the sociologist, though not all are of equal importance. Natural, genetic social groups, which may be called "communities," serve best to exhibit sociological problems. Through the study of such simple and primary groups as the family and the neighborhood group, for example, the problems of sociology can be much better attacked than through the study of society at large or in general. In this text the family will be taken as the simplest and in many ways the most typical form of human association, to illustrate concretely the laws and principles of social organization and development in general.

From what has been said it may be inferred that *society* as a scientific term is nearly synonymous with the abstract term *association*, and this is correct. A word may be said also as to the meaning of the word *social*. The sense in which this word will generally be used in this text is that of a collective adjective, referring to all that pertains to or relates to society in any way. The word *social* is much broader than the words *industrial*, *political*, *moral*, and *religious*, and embraces them all; that is, *social phenomena are all phenomena which involve the interaction of two or more individuals.*

Human Society and Culture or Civilization.—The social life of man differs profoundly from the group life of the animals below man. Social evolution, to be sure, begins with animal associations, but the relations between the members of animal groups are determined mainly by the forces of their heredity. Man and human groups, on the contrary, live chiefly by their power to learn. Members of hu-

man groups relate themselves to the other members of their group very largely through what they are taught by others, and they carry on their group life with its complex adjustments through various forms of intercommunication. Now this ability to live in accordance with patterns which have been taught and learned, and to modify conduct by means of communication, is what we mean by human culture, or civilization in the broadest sense of the word. It manifests itself in such distinctive phases of social life as industry, law, government, science, art, education, morality, and religion. Collectively, these constitute "culture," as they are all socially acquired and socially transmitted by means of processes of teaching and learning. No brute shows these various phases of culture. Man is the only animal which produces culture, but all human groups so far as is known possess all of these phases of culture because they all possess verbal language which is the vehicle for diffusing and transmitting culture. *The development of culture in its various phases is therefore what distinguishes the social life of man from the social life of brutes.*

In this scientific sense, however, culture means not the higher phases of civilization, as it often means in popular usage, but all behavior patterns socially acquired and socially transmitted by means of learning. The scientific meaning of the term "culture" is, therefore, quite different from its popular connotation. The student should note, also, that industry, law, government, science, art, morality, and religion as phases of culture are themselves products of the social life of man. Beneath them lie the biological and psychological facts of human nature and human relations. In order to understand industry, law, government, science, art, morality, and religion we must understand man's social evolution and existing social life.

All of these phases of culture, or civilization, react upon human social life and mould it in various directions. Human society can not be understood without taking into account the full effect of all of these phases of culture. It is a mistake to interpret human society exclusively or preponderantly in terms of any one of these, whether

it is industry, government, science, or religion. Such interpretation gives rise to one-sided views which sociology should correct.

The human individual as we know him is very largely a product of the culture of his group. The child, for example, before school age, gets his culture from his family group, his play groups, and his neighborhood group. These largely shape his personality. While it may not be correct to say that personality is a reflex of culture, since many elements that are not strictly cultural enter into human personality, nevertheless personality is moulded very largely by what we learn, and hence is largely produced by the culture of the individual and his group. This shows the very close and complex relation between individual character and social life. We have no knowledge of individuals apart from society or of a society apart from individuals. Human life is everywhere a collective or associative life, the individual being on the one hand largely a product of the social life surrounding him, and society, on the other hand, being largely an expression of individual character. The reasons for all these assertions will appear as our subject is developed in this and later chapters.

What is Sociology?—The science which deals with human society, its origin, development, forms, and functions, is sociology. Briefly, sociology is a science which deals with society as a whole and not merely with one or several of its separate aspects or phases. It attempts to formulate the laws or principles which govern social organization and social evolution. This means that the main problems of sociology are those of the organization of society on the one hand and the evolution of society on the other. These words, *organization* and *evolution*, however, are used in a broader sense in sociology than they are generally used. By organization is meant any relation of the parts of society to each other. By evolution is meant, not necessarily change for the better, but orderly change of any sort. Sociology is, therefore, a science which deals with the laws or principles of social organization and of social change. Put in more exact terms, this makes sociology *the science of the origin, development, structure, and functioning of social groups.*

Certain faulty conceptions of sociology have greatly impeded its progress as a science. We must not conceive of sociology, for example, as an encyclopedic science of all social phenomena; for there are manifestly other sciences of social phenomena, such as economics and politics. Again, it is wrong to conceive of sociology as the science of human institutions; for there are other sciences dealing with human institutions and, besides, the noninstitutional activities of our social life are scarcely less important sociologically than the institutional. Finally, it is extremely inadequate to conceive of sociology as a study of social evils and their remedies. The development of sociology is indispensable for the correction of social evils, for the elimination of social maladjustments; but it must study primarily the laws of normal social organization and evolution rather than the abnormal elements in our social life; for the abnormal is an incident, a faulty development within the normal. By understanding the laws of social normality, however, we may be able to correct the abnormal.

The distinction between sociology and the other sciences, however, is one of problems. Thus by understanding what the problems of sociology are, we shall be able to understand its relations to other sciences.

The Problems of Sociology.—The problems of sociology fall into two great classes: first, problems of the organization of society; second, problems of the evolution of society. The problems of the organization of society are problems of the relations of individuals and groups to one another and to institutions. They include not only problems of group structure, but also problems of group functioning. Such are, for example, problems of group unity, and so of national unity; or problems of the influence of various factors in physical nature or in the human mind upon social organization. These problems may be considered as problems of society in a hypothetically stationary condition, or at rest. For this reason Auguste Comte, the founder of modern sociology, called the division of sociology which deals with such problems *Social Statics*.

But the problems which are of the most interest and importance in sociology are those of social evolution. Under this head come all problems of social origins and of social change. Especially important practically among these are the problems of social progress and of social retrogression; that is, the causes of the advance of communities, nations, and civilizations to higher types of social life, and the causes of social decline. The former problem, social progress, is in a peculiar sense the central problem of sociology. The effort of theoretical sociology is to develop a scientific theory of social progress. The study of social evolution, then, that is, of social changes of all sorts, as emphasized above, is the vital part of sociology; and it is manifest that only a general science of society, or complete sociology, is competent to deal with such a problem. Inasmuch as the problems of social evolution are problems of change, development, or movement in society, Comte proposed that this division of sociology be called *Social Dynamics.*

The Relations of Sociology to Other Sciences.[1]—(1) *Relations to Biology and Psychology.* In attempting to give a scientific view of social organization and social evolution, sociology has to depend upon the natural sciences, particularly upon biology and psychology. It is manifest that sociology must depend upon biology, since biology is the general science of life, and human society is but part of the world of life in general. It is manifest also that sociology must depend upon psychology to explain the interactions between individuals, because these interactions are for the most part interactions between their minds. Thus on the one hand all social phenomena are vital phenomena and on the other hand nearly all social phenomena are on the mental plane. Every social problem has, in other words, its psychological and its biological sides, and sociology is distinguished from biology and psychology only as a matter of convenience. The scientific division of labor necessitates that certain scientific workers

[1]For a fuller discussion of the relations of sociology to other sciences, see the author's advanced text, *The Psychology of Human Society* (published by the Appleton-Century Company).

concern themselves with certain problems. Now, the problems with which the biologist and the psychologist deal are not the problems of the organization and evolution of society. Hence, while the sociologist borrows principles of interpretation from biology and psychology, he has his own distinctive problems, and it is this fact which makes sociology a distinct science.

Sociology is not so easily distinguished from the special social sciences, such as politics and economics, as it is from the other general sciences. These sciences occupy the same field as sociology, that is, they have to do with social phenomena. But in general, as has already been pointed out, they are concerned chiefly with certain very special aspects or phases of the social life and not with its most general problems. If sociology, then, is dependent upon the other general sciences, particularly upon biology and psychology, it is obvious that its relation to the special sciences is the reverse: namely, these sciences are dependent upon sociology. This is only saying practically the same thing as was said above when it was pointed out that industry, government, and religion are phases of human social life. In other words, sociology deals with the more general aspects of human relations, while the special sciences of economics, politics, and the like generally deal with certain products or highly specialized phases of society.

(2) *Relations to History.* A word may be said about the relation of sociology to another science which also deals with human society in a general way, and that is history. History is a concrete, descriptive science of society which attempts to construct a picture of the social past. Sociology, however, is an abstract, theoretical science of society concerned with the laws and principles which govern social organization and social change. In one sense, sociology is narrower than history inasmuch as it is an abstract science, and in another sense it is wider than history because it concerns itself not only with the social past but also with the social present. The facts of contemporary social life are indeed even more important to the sociologist than the facts of history, although it is impossible to construct a theory of

social evolution without taking into full account all the facts available in human history, and for this reason we must consider history one of the very important methods of sociology. Upon its evolutionary or dynamic side sociology may be considered a sort of philosophy of history; at least it attempts to give a scientific theory which will explain the social changes which history describes concretely.

(3) *Relations to Economics.* Economics is that special social science which deals with the wealth-getting and wealth-using activities of man. In other words, it is concerned with the commercial and industrial activities of men. As has already been implied, economics must be considered one of the most important of the special social sciences, if not the most important. Yet it is evident that the wealth-getting and wealth-using activities of man are strictly an outgrowth of his social life, and that economics as a science of human industry must rest upon sociology. Sometimes in the past the mistake has been made of supposing that economics dealt with the most fundamental social phenomena, and even at times economists have spoken of their science as alone sufficient to explain all social phenomena. It would not be possible, however, properly to explain social organization in general or social progress in terms of economic development only. A theory of progress, for example, in which the sole causes of human progress were found in economic conditions would neglect political, religious, educational, and many other conditions. Only a very one-sided theory of society could be built upon such a basis. Economics should keep to its own sphere of explaining the commercial and industrial activities of man and not attempt to become a general science dealing with social evolution. This is now recognized by practically all economists of standing, and the only question which remains is whether economics is independent of sociology or whether it rests upon sociology.

The view of the most advanced economic thinkers of the present day is that economics should rest upon sociology. That economics does rest upon sociology is shown by many considerations. The chief problem of theoretical economics is the problem of economic value.

But economic value is but one sort of value which is recognized in society, moral and aesthetic values being other examples of the valuing process, and socially prevalent values express the collective judgment of some human group. The problem of economic value, in other words, reduces itself to a problem in social psychology, and when this is said it is equivalent to making economics dependent upon sociology, for social psychology is largely the psychological aspect of sociology. Again, industrial organization and industrial evolution are but parts or phases of social evolution in general, and it is safe to say that industry, both in its organization and in its evolution, cannot be understood apart from social conditions, especially the conditions of civilization in a given society. Again, many non-economic forces continually obtrude themselves upon the student of economic conditions, such as custom, invention, imitation, standards, ideals, and the like. These are general social forces which play throughout all phases of human social life and so show the dependence of industry upon society in general, and, therefore, the dependence of economics upon sociology. Much more might be said in the way of concretely illustrating these statements, but the purpose of this text precludes anything but the briefest and most elementary statement of these theoretical facts.

(4) *Relations to Politics.* We have already seen that the state is one of the chief forms of human association. The science which treats of the state or of government is known as political science or politics. It is one of the oldest of the social sciences, having been more or less systematized by Aristotle. The problems of politics are those of the origin, nature, function, and development of government. It is manifest that politics, on both its practical and its theoretical side, has many close relations to sociology. While the state or nation must not be confused with society in general, yet because the state is the most imposing, if not the most important, form of human association, the relations of politics and sociology must be very intimate. On the one hand, political scientists can scarcely understand the origin, nature, and proper functions of government without understanding more or

less about the social life generally; and, on the other hand, the sociologist finds that one of the most important facts of human society is that of social control, or of authority. While political science deals only with the organized authority manifested in the state, which we call government, yet inasmuch as this is the most important form of social control, and inasmuch as political organization is one of the chief manifestations of social organization, the sociologist can scarcely deal adequately with the great problems of social organization and evolution without constant reference to political science.

An important branch of political science is jurisprudence, or the science of law. This, again, is closely related to sociology, on both its theoretical and its practical side. Law is, perhaps, the most important means of social control made use of by society, and the sociologist needs to understand something of the principles of law in order to understand the nature of the existing social order. On the other hand, the jurist needs to know the principles of social organization and evolution in general before he can understand the nature and purpose of law.

(5) *Relations to Ethics.*[1] Ethics is the science which deals with the right or wrong of human conduct. Its problems are the nature of morality and of moral obligation, the validity of moral ideals, the norms by which conduct is to be judged, and the like. While ethics was once considered to be a science of individual conduct it is now generally conceived as being essentially a social science. The moral and the social are indeed not clearly separable, but we may consider the moral to be the ideal aspect of the social.

This view of morality, which, for the most part, is indorsed by modern thought, makes ethics dependent upon social knowledge for its criteria of rightness or wrongness. Indeed, we cannot argue any moral question nowadays unless we argue it in social terms. If we discuss the rightness or wrongness of the drink habit, we try to show

[1]For a full statement of the author's views regarding the relations of sociology and ethics, see the chapter on "The Sociological Basis of Ethics" in the author's book, *Methods in Sociology* (published by Duke University Press, 1933).

its social consequences. So, too, if we discuss the rightness or wrongness of such an institution as polygamy, we find ourselves forced to do so mainly in social terms. This is not denying, of course, that there are religious and metaphysical aspects to morality,—these are not necessarily in conflict with the social aspects,—but it is saying that modern ethical theory is coming more and more to base itself upon the study of the remote social consequences of conduct, and that we cannot judge what is right or wrong in our complex society unless we know something of the social consequences.

Ethics must be regarded, therefore, as a normative science to which sociology and the other social sciences lead up. It is, indeed, very difficult to separate ethics from sociology. It is the business of sociology to indicate standards of normality to ethics, and it is the business of ethics as a science to take the norms and standards indicated by the social sciences and develop them, and criticize them. This text, therefore, will not attempt to exclude ethical implications and judgments from sociological discussions, because that would be futile.

(6) *Relations to Education.* Among the applied sciences, sociology is especially closely related to education, for education is not simply the art of developing the powers and capacities of the individual; it is rather the fitting of individuals for efficient membership, for proper functioning, in social life. On its individual side, education should initiate the individual into the social life and fit him for social service. It should create the good citizen. On the social or public side, education should be the chief means of social progress. It should regenerate society, by fitting the individual for a higher type of social life than at present achieved. We must have a socialized education if our present complex civilization is to endure. Social problems touch education on every side, and, on the other hand, education must bear upon every social problem. It is evident, therefore, that sociology has a very great bearing upon the problems of education; and the teacher who comes to his task equipped with a knowledge of social conditions and of the laws and principles of social organiza-

tion and evolution will find a significance and meaning in his work which he could hardly find otherwise.

(7) *Relations to "Home Economics."* "Home economics," or domestic science, is another good example of an applied social science which rests upon sociology. So far as it deals merely with the physical problems of the household group, such as nutrition and sanitation, it rests upon chemistry, physiology, bacteriology, and other physical sciences. But so far as it deals with the higher life of the family, with the "home" in the true sense, it must rest upon sociology. Sociology comes in, then, to give a point of view and of approach; for the practical problems of the family life cannot be properly viewed unless the function of the family in human society is understood, and even something is known of the origin and evolution of the family as a form of association.

(8) *Relations to Social Work.*[1] If social and philanthropic work is to be scientific, it must rest chiefly upon sociology. The elimination of hereditary defectiveness, the overcoming of the social maladjustments of individuals, and the correction of faulty social and industrial conditions—the three great tasks of scientific social work—all require great knowledge of human society. While economics and political science furnish indispensable facts for the social worker, the general laws of normal social life, or human living together, must be sought in sociology. Sociology stands in much the same relation, therefore, to scientific social work as biology does to medicine, and hence the social worker requires thorough equipment in sociology that he may approach his tasks aright.

Whether social work aims to be remedial, that is, to restore to normal social life dependents, defectives, and delinquents; or preventive, that is, to remove the causes of social misery; or constructive, that is, to develop a higher degree of social welfare for all, it must take into account at every step the laws which govern human relations, the principles of social normality, the causes of social malad-

[1]Additional reading on this topic may be found in the author's *Methods in Sociology*, Chapter XI.

justment, and the agencies of social progress; and these must be sought fundamentally in sociology.

The Relations of Sociology to Social Reconstruction.[1]—When sociology is applied to human relations, it becomes a science of social adjustment. As shown by the present condition of mankind, most of the individuals, classes, and nations do not know even the simplest facts of successful living together. Every human group from the family to civilization itself seems to be threatened with disintegration. War has left our civilization torn and divided and has revealed fatal weaknesses in many of our institutions. Social readjustments along many lines have become necessary. Hence many programs of reconstruction have been presented. To judge between these the citizen needs to know the fundamental principles of social organization and of social progress—the laws of social survival, of social efficiency, and of social harmony. We no longer build bridges without consulting bridge engineers; neither should we attempt to build institutions without the fullest use of social knowledge. To judge the many social programs of the present, then, the citizen needs a knowledge of sociology.

Among the many party programs put forward as a basis for social reconstruction at the present time, for example, is socialism; and of socialism there are many varieties, from the extreme revolutionary class socialism, which is now popularly known as Bolshevism from the party name of its Russian advocates, to the relatively conservative type of socialism exemplified in the platform of the British Labor Party. Now, while sociology has no logical connection with socialism or any other party program, it is evident that the various forms of socialism cannot be properly understood or intelligently criticized without knowledge of sociology. This is true of all party programs, but it is especially true of socialism, for in many of its forms it rests upon a particular social philosophy or theory of social evolution,

[1]Additional reading on this topic (which may be best taken up, however, after Chapter VIII) may be found in the author's book on *The Social Problem* (published by The Macmillan Company).

namely, the theory that all social evolution is determined by economic conditions. Just how we should regard the philosophy of revolutionary socialism in the light of scientific sociology, we shall see in a later chapter; in this introductory chapter we are concerned only to notice that the socialist program and all other social reconstruction programs of the present need to be tested by sociological knowledge.

It is not simply proposals and programs which need to be tested by the citizen; many new social experiments which are now being tried throughout our civilization manifestly depend for their success upon a general diffusion of social intelligence. Democracy itself, indeed, is such an experiment. Democracy means a social life in which the opinion and will of every normal adult counts in the determination of social policies. Obviously the success of democracy depends upon the possibility of vast masses of men forming rational opinions and executing rational decisions as a group. That is possible only through social and political education. We must educate for democracy if we wish it to succeed; and that means that we must diffuse knowledge not merely of the machinery of democratic government, but of social conditions which must be dealt with by such government, and of the duties of citizens in regard to such conditions.

Freedom in the intellectual, moral, and political realms is the indispensable preliminary to carry out any rational plan of social reconstruction; for the mind is man's chief organ of adaptation, and when the mind is not free it cannot function. Sociology shows that intercommunication is the chief method of reciprocal adaptation among individuals. As soon as freedom of thought and public discussion are abridged, the whole machinery of social adjustment in a group will be hampered, because it will become impossible to compare ideas and hence to reach rational judgment regarding social policies. Free thought, free discussion, free formation of public opinion, and free selection among social policies and social leaders are accordingly the indispensable means of normal conscious social progress. They are particularly indispensable in a democracy where public opinion is supposed to rule and to decide upon policies of public action. Where

these are in whole or in part denied, perverted social development is bound to result, and social disaster in the form either of social strife or of social disorganization is apt to take place.

Hence as a preliminary to rational social reconstruction, especially if we wish to build a free democratic society, must be the maintenance of all conditions necessary for intellectual, moral, and political freedom. To this every democratically-minded American would probably agree; but many apparently fail to see that reconstructive efforts must be guided by scientific knowledge. A part of this knowledge will be found in other social sciences, but sociology contains much of the most fundamental knowledge needed.

It is obvious that sociology, if it is to be impartial, must not be developed in the interest of any class, party, or particular reform. Rather it must aim at the discovery of the full truth regarding human relations. And this truth when discovered will be the means of deciding the wisdom or unwisdom of any proposed reform or program of social reconstruction. Thus scientific truth is practical in the deepest sense. Only unbiased knowledge can lead us aright; and hence to learn to lay aside class, party, or personal bias and to see social facts as they are, is the only method by which we can hope to build a better human world.

The physical sciences have enabled man to attain to a considerable mastery over physical nature, and thus have greatly benefited humanity. They have done this because they explain the relations of phenomena, and when these relations are explained the appearance of definite phenomena in the physical world can be predicted. Thus the physical sciences have given man control over physical forces. They have made such careful investigation and secured such accurate information regarding the working of physical forces that they have given man the key to success in controlling them.

Hitherto, however, our knowledge of social life has remained vague and indefinite. Social phenomena are just as impossible to explain, predict, and control without scientific study as are physical phenomena. But we have every reason to believe that, just as the physical sciences

have enabled man to master nature, so the social sciences will enable man to control his own nature and his social life. This control has been demonstrated to be even more important for man's happiness and welfare than the control of physical nature.

Scientific Method in Sociology.—Science is at bottom a search for the truth. The social sciences should accordingly be open-minded, unbiased searches for the truth regarding human social life. They must be willing to make use of reliable knowledge from any source. Hence, they must be to a certain extent synthetic, that is, using the knowledge furnished by antecedent sciences such as biology and psychology. This is particularly true of sociology. Scientific sociology must seek reliable knowledge wherever it can find such knowledge. It cannot limit itself to purely inductive methods, that is, to facts from contemporary society and from history and anthropology. It must also be willing to make use of biological and psychological facts and principles wherever they apply in human relations. It must particularly avoid methods which lead to one-sided views. Hence, philosophical biases which prevent the recognition of some facts or put overemphasis on others must be especially avoided. As a British sociologist has said, sociology "must purge itself of that mechanistic taint which pollutes its sources of vital thought, inhibits spiritual insight, and lowers its efficiency for social service." A competent and sound scientific method should be capable of producing competent and sound social knowledge and, ultimately, wise methods of controlling human relations; for while the immediate aim of science is truth, its ultimate aim must be to aid man in controlling the conditions of life.

To get truth, science begins with careful observations; but ordinary observation does not go far in telling us about human motives, whether these are attitudes, opinions, beliefs, wishes, desires, or values. Evidently we must supplement the careful observation which should be the foundation of all science, by human experience in the widest sense, in the family, in the neighborhood, in the nation, and in human history.

Through the study of the experience of human beings in all of these groups throughout human history, sociologists have found ways of getting accurate, tested knowledge concerning human relations. They have found, in particular, a scientific approach to human problems through the study of the small face-to-face groups of men, such as the family, the neighborhood, and the play group. These are called "primary groups," since originally there were none other. Much about human relations in these groups can be directly observed. They, therefore, furnish an excellent starting point for the scientific understanding of human relations and of social behavior generally. Now the human primary groups—the family, the neighborhood, and the play group—all show that social behavior in them is learned. Usually individuals in them learn from other individuals what their relations are in the group and how they should act in those relations. Usually the elders teach the younger, and we see at once that these relations are rooted in group history and group experience. We see also that the adjustments in these groups depend upon the human mind, because they are learned, and that ultimately they are the product of the human mind working to control both the forces of nature and human relations.

It follows that sociology is not a science of the blind forces of nature, but of the more or less intelligent adjustments, even though they may be often erroneous, which human individuals and human groups have made both to one another and to the physical conditions of life. As these adjustments have been learned, they can be modified, and careful study may show not only how they can be changed, but also how they can be improved so as to create a more satisfying and harmonious life for all mankind.

Thus we see that the ultimate aim of sociology, as of all other science, is mastery over life and its conditions; and hence its practical aim is nothing less than to replace the social confusion of the present with an intelligent policy of scientific mastery over the conditions of our social existence. It is only upon such a scientific basis that social reconstruction can be successful.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Psychology of Human Society: An Introduction to Sociological Theory*, Chap. I.
GREGORY, E. W., and BIDGOOD, L., *Introductory Sociology*, Chap. I.
GROVES, E. R., and MOORE, H. E., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chap. I.
ODUM, H. W., *Man's Quest for Social Guidance*, Chaps. I-V.

For more extended reading:

BERNARD, L. L., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chap. I.
BERNARD, L. L., *Introduction to Social Psychology*, Chaps. I, II.
BOGARDUS, B. S., *Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chap. I.
DOW, G. S., *Society and Its Problems*, Rev. Ed., Chap. I.
GILLIN, J. L., and GILLIN, J. P., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. I, II.
HANKINS, F. H., *An Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chap. I.
HILLER, E. T., *Principles of Sociology*, Chaps. I, II.
LUMLEY, F. E., *Principles of Sociology*, 2nd Ed., Chap. I.
MACIVER, R. M., *Society: A Textbook of Sociology*, Chap. I.
PARK, R. E., and BURGESS, E. W., *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Chap. I.
PARSONS, P. A., *An Introduction to Modern Social Problems*, Chap. IV.
REUTER, E. B., and HART, C. W., *Introduction to Sociology*, Chap. I.
ROSS, E. A., *Foundations of Sociology*, Chaps. I-IV.
WARD, L. F., *Outlines of Sociology*, Chaps. I-VI.

Periodicals:

American Journal of Sociology (published by the University of Chicago Press.)
Sociology and Social Research (published by the University of Southern California).
Social Forces (Published by Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md.)
The Survey (published by Survey Associates, Inc., 112 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.)

American Sociological Review (published by the American Sociological Society.)

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What is the nature of science? of social science?
2. What is the method of science? How do the social sciences differ from the physical sciences?
3. What is social life? What are the two marks of social life?
4. What is a society?
5. State and criticize some faulty conceptions of society.
6. What is social evolution? What does it include, and what is its method?
7. What is "culture"? Why is it important for human sociology?
8. What is a "community"? Name some other forms of social groups.
9. What is sociology? State and criticize some faulty conceptions of sociology.
10. How does sociology differ from psychology?
11. What is the relation of social psychology (in the sense of a psychological study of social life) to sociology?
12. What are the problems of sociology? Illustrate.
13. Is there also a biological part to sociology? Show this and its significance.
14. What is the basis for the distinction between sciences? Does this hold for the distinction between the social sciences? Illustrate.
15. State fully the bearing of sociology and social psychology upon each of the following sciences: (a) history; (b) economics; (c) politics; (d) ethics; (e) education; (f) home economics; (g) social work.
16. What methods should sociology employ? Illustrate from the study of the family.
17. What is the value for sociology of the anthropological method? of the historical method? of the social survey method? of statistics? of personal observation?
18. What is the place in sociology of deduction? of philosophical assumptions? of synthesis?
19. Is a purely objective or physical explanation of social phenomena adequate? If not, why not?

20. What has been the chief source of most of the mistakes in social policy and in social practice in the past?

21. What is the relation of sociology (a) to socialism; (b) to social reconstruction?

For classroom discussion:

1. Is sociology necessary for a thorough understanding of economics? of politics? of history? of education?

2. How can sciences best be distinguished, by subject matter or by problems?

3. Should the social sciences be a basis for value-judgments (judgments of "good" or "bad") as to social adjustments in human relations?

4. What is the most valuable subject you are studying in preparation for citizenship? Why?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should high school and college students give more attention to the Social Studies even at the cost of giving less attention to vocational subjects and the natural sciences?

CHAPTER II

THE BEARING OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION UPON SOCIAL PROBLEMS

SINCE Darwin wrote his *Origin of Species* (published in 1859) all the sciences in any way connected with biology have been profoundly influenced by his theory of evolution. It is important that the student of sociology, therefore, should understand at the outset something of the bearing of the theory of evolution upon social problems.

We may note at the beginning, however, that the word *evolution* refers to two distinct, though related, theories. The first is Darwin's doctrine of descent; the second is Spencer's theory of universal evolution. Let us note somewhat in detail what the theory of evolution means in the first of these senses.

The Darwinian Theory of Descent.—Darwin's theory of descent is the doctrine that all forms of life now existing or that have existed upon the earth have sprung from a few simple primitive types. According to this theory all forms of animals and plants have sprung from a few primitive stocks, though not necessarily one, because even in the beginning there may have existed a divergence between the primitive forms of life. So far as the animal world is concerned, then, this theory of evolution amounts to the assertion of the kinship of all life. From one or more simple primitive unicellular forms have arisen the great multitudes of both unicellular and multicellular forms that now exist. Popularly, Darwin's theory is supposed to be that man sprang from the apes, but this, strictly speaking, is a misconception. Darwin's theory necessitates the belief, not that man sprang from any existing species of ape, but rather that the apes and man have sprung from some common stock. It is equally true, however, that, according to this theory, man and very many of the lower

animals have come from a common stock. As was said above, the theory is not a theory of the descent of man from any particular animal type, but rather the theory of the kinship, the genetic relationship, of all animal species.

It is evident that if we accept Darwin's theory of descent in sociology we must look for the beginnings of many peculiarly human things in the animal world below man. Human institutions, according to this theory, could not be supposed to have an independent origin, or human society in any of its forms to be a fact by itself, but rather all human things are connected with the whole world of animal life below man. Thus if we are, according to this theory, to look for the origin of the family, we should have to turn first of all to the habits of animals nearest man. This is only one of the many bearings which Darwin's theory has upon the study of social problems; but it is evident even from this that it revolutionizes sociology. So long as it was possible to look upon human society as a distinct creation, as something isolated, by itself in nature, it was possible to hold to intellectualistic views of the origin of human institutions.

But someone may ask: Why should the sociologist accept Darwin's theory? What proofs does it rest upon? What warrant has a student of sociology for accepting a doctrine of such far-reaching consequences? The reply is that biologists, generally, after a careful study of Darwin's arguments and after a careful examination of all other evidence, have come universally to accept the doctrine of descent. While modern biology is no longer narrowly Darwinian, yet no biologist of standing now living questions the *fact* of organic evolution, although its *cause* is a matter of dispute. Briefly, the evidence which establishes the fact of organic evolution is as follows:

(1) There are very striking homologies or similarities of structure between all the higher animals. Between the ape and man, for example, there are over one hundred and fifty such anatomical homologies; that is, in the ape we find bone for bone, and muscle for muscle, corresponding to the structure of the human body. Even an animal

so remotely related to man as the cat has, in anatomical structure, many more resemblances to man than dissimilarities. Now, the meaning of these anatomical homologies, biologists say, is that these animals are genetically related; that is, they had a common ancestry at some remote period in the past.

(2) The presence of vestigial organs in the higher animals supplies another argument for the belief in common descent. In man, for example, there exist over one hundred of these vestigial or rudimentary organs, as the vermiform appendix, the pineal gland, and the like. Many of these vestigial organs, which are now functionless in man, perform functions in lower animals, and this is held to show that at some remote period in the past they also functioned in man's ancestors.

(3) The facts of embryology seem to point to the descent of the higher types of animals from the lower types. The embryo or fetus in its development seems to recapitulate the various stages through which the species has passed. Thus the human embryo at one stage of its development resembles the embryo of a fish; at another stage, the embryo of a dog; and for a long time it is difficult to find any difference between the human embryo and that of one of the larger apes. These embryological facts, biologists say, indicate genetic relation between the various animal forms which the embryo in its different stages simulates.

(4) In the earth's crust are found the fossil remains of extinct species of animals which are evidently ancestors of existing species. Until the doctrine of descent was accepted there was no way of explaining the presence of these fossil remains of extinct animals in the earth's crust. It was supposed by some that the earth had passed through a series of cataclysms in which all forms of life upon the earth had been many times destroyed and many times re-created. It is now demonstrated, however, that these fossils are related to existing species, and sometimes it is possible to trace back the evolution of existing forms to very primitive forms in this way. For example, it is possible to trace the horse, which is now an animal with a single

hoof, walking on a single toe, back to an animal that walked upon four toes and had four hoofs and was not much larger than a fox. It is not so generally known that it is also possible to trace man back through a series of fossil human remains that have been discovered in the earth's crust to the time when he was apparently just emerging from some apelike form. The fossil man of Java, *Pithecanthropus erectus*, discovered by Dr. Eugene Dubois in 1892, was a creature of less than two thirds the brain capacity of modern man and with many apelike characteristics. Recently this discovery has been confirmed by the finding of several similar fossils in Java, and the Peking man in China. Moreover, numerous fossil remains of the Neanderthal man, a very primitive human type, though of much later date, have been discovered in Europe. Thus we cannot except even man from the theory of evolution and suppose that he was especially created, as Alfred Russel Wallace, Darwin's contemporary and co-laborer, and others, have held.

(5) The last line of argument in favor of the belief that all existing species have descended from a few simple primitive forms is found in the fact of the variation of animals through artificial selection under domestication. For generations breeders have known that by carefully mating the animals or plants most nearly resembling the type which they have desired, it is possible to produce more and more approximately that type. Thus have originated all the breeds or varieties of domestic plants and animals. Now, Darwin conceived that nature also exercises a selection by weeding out those individuals that are not adapted to their environment. In other words, nature, though unconscious, selects in a negative way the stronger and the better adapted for continued existence. Animals vary in nature as well as under domestication from causes not yet well understood. The variations that were favorable to survival, Darwin argued, would secure the survival, through the passing on of these variations by heredity, of the better adapted types of plants and animals. The natural process of weeding out the inferior or least adapted through early death, or through failure to reproduce, Darwin called "natural

selection," and likened it in its effect upon organisms to the artificial selection which breeders consciously use to secure types of plants or animals that they desire.

A great addition to Darwin's theories has been made by the Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries, who has shown that the variations which are fruitful for the production of new species are probably great and sudden variations, which he terms "mutations," instead of the small fluctuating variations which Darwin thought were probably most important in the production of new species. De Vries's theory in no way affects the doctrine of descent, nor does it take away from the importance of natural selection in fixing the variations. The doctrine of descent, therefore, stands in all of its essentials to-day unquestioned by men of science, and it must be assumed by the student of sociology in any attempt to explain social evolution.

Spencer's Theory of Universal Evolution.—A second meaning given to the word *evolution* is that which Spencer popularized in his *First Principles*. This is a philosophical theory of the universe which asserts that not only species of animals have come to be what they are through a process of development, but everything whatsoever that exists, from molecules of matter to stars and planets. It is the view that the universe is in a process of development. Evolution in this wider sense includes all existing things whatsoever, while evolution in the sense of Darwin's theory is confined to the organic world. While the theory that all things existing have through a process of orderly change come to be what they are, is a very old one, yet it was undoubtedly Spencer's writings which popularized the theory, and to Spencer we also owe the attempt in his *Synthetic Philosophy* to trace the working of evolution in all the different realms of phenomena. The belief in universal evolution which Spencer popularized has also come to be generally accepted by scientific and philosophical thinkers. While Spencer's particular theories of evolution may not be accepted, some form of universal evolution is very generally believed in. The thought of evolution now dominates all the sciences,—physical, biological, psychological, and sociological. It is evident that

the student of society, if he accepts fully the modern scientific spirit, must also assume evolution in this second or universal sense.

The Different Phases of Universal Evolution.—It may be well, in order to correlate our knowledge of social evolution with knowledge in general, to note the five different well-marked phases of universal evolution.

(1) *Cosmic Evolution.* This is the phase the astronomer and the geologist are particularly interested in. It deals with the evolution of worlds. This cosmic evolution is of physical matter only, and it is supposed that the active principle which works in this phase of evolution is the attraction of particles of matter for one another. This leads to the condensation of matter into suns and their planets, and the geological evolution of the earth, for example. Laplace's nebular hypothesis is an attempt to give an adequate statement of the cosmic phase of evolution. While this hypothesis has been much criticized of late, in its essentials it seems to stand. We are not, however, as students of society, concerned with this phase of evolution.

(2) *Organic Evolution.* This is the phase of evolution with which Darwin dealt and which biology, as a science of evolution of living forms, deals with. The great merit of Darwin's work was that he showed that the decisive factor in this phase of evolution is natural selection; that is, the extermination of the unadapted through death or through failure to reproduce. Types unsuited to their environment thus die before reproduction. The stronger and better fitted survive, and thus the type is raised. Natural selection may be regarded, then, as essentially the determining force in this phase of evolution.

(3) *The Evolution of Mind.* This might be included in organic evolution, but while many organisms have minds, many others apparently do not. It is evident that among animals those that would stand the best chance of surviving would not be simply those that have the strongest brute strength, but rather those that have the keenest intelligence and that could adapt themselves quickly to their environment, and could see approaching danger and escape it. Natural selection has, therefore, favored in the animal world the survival

of those animals with the highest type of intelligence. It cannot be said, however, that natural selection has created the mind in all its various expressions. It has merely favored the development of the mind.

(4) *Social Evolution.* By social evolution is meant the evolution of groups, or, in strict accordance with the correct definition of society, groups of mentally interacting individuals. Groups are to be found throughout the animal world, and it is in the human species, as we have already seen, that the highest types of association are found. This is not an accident. Association, or living together in groups, has been one of the devices by which animal species have been enabled to survive. It is evident that not only would intelligence, more than brute strength, help an animal to survive, but that ability to co-operate with one's fellows would also help in the same way. Consequently we find a degree of combination or co-operation almost at the very beginning of life, and it is without doubt through co-operation that man has become the dominant and supreme species upon the planet. 'Man's social nature, in other words, has been perhaps even more important for his survival than his intelligence. The man who lies, cheats, and steals, or who indulges in other unsocial conduct, sets himself against his group and places his group at a disadvantage as compared with other groups. Natural selection operates upon groups as well as upon individuals, and so is at work in social as well as in organic evolution. The group which can command the most loyal, most efficient membership, and has the best organization, is, other things being equal, the group which survives. But the active principle of social evolution is the new and distinct factor of co-operation or coadaptation.

(5) *Cultural Evolution.* The social life of man shows a distinct phase of evolution, the evolution of culture or civilization. This phase of development is not found in the animal world below man. It has its organic basis in man's superior brain, his power of articulate speech, and his consequent greater capacity to learn and to communicate what he learns. It depends, therefore, upon man's learning, especially

his learning from other members of his group, through his superior powers of communicating experience. It is not an evolution of hereditary traits, but of habits, ideas, and values. Hence it proceeds independently of organic evolution, and much more rapidly. All human groups show some degree of cultural evolution, but there are only slight foreshadowings of this phase of evolution in the animals below man, as the vehicle of cultural evolution is largely articulate speech, which no animal below man possesses. It is a result of learning by experience and storing that experience in language or in other symbols. Thus human societies are able to live not only by the experience of individuals, but by the stored-up experience of the group, which is called "the social tradition."

The development of the social tradition is therefore essentially the determining force in cultural evolution. But this tradition concerns religion and morals, law, government, art, science, education. The development of the social tradition along these various lines is what leads to the development of human culture or civilization as a whole. Hence it is evident that cosmic, organic, mental, and animal social evolution furnish only a basis for the evolution which is at work in human society. Mankind is affected by these four lower phases of evolution, but *the evolution which mankind is undergoing is dominantly cultural evolution.* Nevertheless we need to understand how cultural evolution is affected by geographic, biological, and psychological factors.

Factors in Organic Evolution.—As has just been implied, the factors which are at work in organic evolution generally are also at work in human social evolution. We need, therefore, to note these factors carefully and to see how they are at work in human society as well as in the animal world below man. While these factors are not all of the factors which are at work in social evolution, still they are the primitive factors, and are, therefore, of fundamental importance. Let us see what these factors are.

(1) *The Multiplication of Organisms in Some Geometric Ratio through Reproduction.* It is a law of life that every species must in-

crease so that the number of offspring exceeds the number of parents if the species is to survive. If the offspring only equal in number the parents, some of them will die before maturity is reached or will fail (for other reasons) to reproduce, and so the species will gradually become extinct. Every species normally increases, therefore, in some geometric ratio. Now, this tendency to reproduce in some geometric ratio, which characterizes all living organisms, means that any species, if left to itself, would soon reach such numbers as to occupy the whole earth. Darwin showed, for example, that though the elephant is the slowest-breeding of all animals, if every elephant lived its normal length of life (one hundred years) and to every pair were born six offspring, then at the end of seven hundred and fifty years there would be nineteen million living elephants descended from a single pair. This illustration shows the enormous possibilities of any species reproducing in geometric ratio, as all species in order to survive must do.

That this tendency to increase in some geometric ratio applies also to man is evident from all of the facts which we know concerning human populations. It is not infrequent for a people to double its numbers every twenty-five years. If this were continued for any length of time it is evident that a single nation could soon populate the whole earth. Malthus, an English economist at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was the first to study systematically this multiplication of human populations in some geometric ratio and its consequences. He argued from it that there was always a tendency for population to outstrip food supply, and that this was a permanent cause of social misery. Consequently he held that if better wages, and so a larger food supply, were given to the lower economic classes of society, they would multiply so much more rapidly that worse poverty would result than before. While we shall see in a later chapter that Malthus carried his theory too far, yet there is no doubt that under certain conditions in human society there is a tendency for population to press against food supply, and that to this multiplication of numbers in human society is due the competition of our social and economic life, as in the world of life at large.

(2) *Heredity.* Heredity is the factor in organic evolution which insures the persistence of the species or racial type. It is that aspect of the phenomenon of reproduction which we recognize by saying, "Like begets like." Essentially, heredity is the transmission of traits from parents to offspring. Much has been written upon heredity in the past, but only recently have the laws or principles of heredity come to be clearly understood by biologists.

Heredity is not less a fact of human society than of the animal world. Racial heredity especially is one of the most significant facts of human society; while even family heredity counts in its influence far more than some have supposed. Biologists generally hold that heredity affects in man not only his physical traits, but also his mental and moral traits, so far as these latter are dependent upon the inborn structure of the brain and nervous sytem.

This brings us to the questions, What traits are transmissible? and How are they transmitted? That certain things are given us by nature, and that others come to us through nurture, or from the influence of our environment, has long been known. Throughout the world of life certain traits of organisms are inherent in their nature, given in the germ, as we say; while other traits are modifications acquired during the lifetime of the individual. Hence the contrast between inborn and acquired traits, a contrast which is of the utmost significance; for probably only inborn traits are transmitted by heredity.

This book cannot go far into the biological theory of heredity. Certain facts and general principles, however, can be pointed out which will save much confusion in the study of social problems. The student of sociology should especially bear in mind three biological facts: (1) The germ cells, out of which the new individual arises, are a separate series of cells, distinct from the body cells. (2) Although the germ cells are separate from the body cells, the body nevertheless affords the environment of the germ cells, and furnishes them with nutrition. (3) In bi-parental reproduction, inheritance is equal from both parents.

From the first fact follows directly Weismann's law of the non-transmissibility of "acquired traits." On account of the separateness of the germ cells from the body cells, there is no way by which specific bodily modifications can be transmitted to offspring. Modifications produced in organs through use or disuse are not, therefore, transmissible. For example, the blacksmith who develops a strong biceps muscle in his work does not transmit this modification to his children.

It must not be supposed, however, that the body has no influence upon the germ cells; for it furnishes their nutrition. If the body is poisoned by a drug such as alcohol, or by the toxins produced by certain diseases, this will affect the germ cells, and the offspring may inherit, on this account, a weakened vitality or a degenerate constitution. This, however, is not the transmission of a specific, acquired trait, but is only the effect of the poisoning or malnutrition of the germ cells in the body of the parent. It is sometimes erroneously supposed that Weismann's theory comes to this, that no matter what the parent individual does, it will not affect his offspring; but from what has been said above it will be seen that this supposition is a gross misunderstanding of the doctrine of the non-transmissibility of acquired traits.

Mendel's law of heredity follows directly from the third fact mentioned, that inheritance from both parents is equal, and from the further fact that hereditary traits are seemingly transmitted as units. It is impossible within the space of this book to explain this very important biological law. It will suffice to say that in consequence of this law there is apparently no permanent blending of different traits, in a series of generations, but that, on the contrary, contrasted traits tend to segregate in definite and regular proportions. For example, if albinos (persons without pigment in hair, eyes, or skin) intermarry with normal persons, their children in the first generation will be apparently all normal persons. But if these children of albinos and normal persons intermarry among themselves, their offspring will be one fourth albinos and three fourths apparently normal persons. And if these latter intermarry, one third will have only normal offspring,

while two thirds will have offspring again in the proportion of one fourth albinos and three fourths apparently normal. This shows that of the second generation one fourth were albinos, one fourth pure normals, and one half hybrids which appeared to be normal but were in fact not so, so far as their germ cells were concerned.

Mendel's law thus shows us the manner of transmission of hereditary traits in individual cases. It is highly important for the sociologist, especially in his study of the results of the crossing of races and of normal with abnormal stocks.

To sum up, the factor of heredity in evolution preserves the continuity of the racial or family type, but the minute, personal traits of the individual are not transmissible, and especially not those which are acquired; in a word, nothing is inherited except the characteristics of the stock, the traits which are inherent in the germ plasm. These hereditary traits, however, not only determine to a large extent the physical characteristics of the adult individual, but also, to a lesser degree, his mental and moral character.

(3) *Variation.* The factor of variation in organic evolution means that no two individuals, even though born of the same parents, are exactly like each other. Neither do they exactly conform in their type to Mendel's law, as theoretically they should do. Every new individual born in the organic world, then, while it resembles its parents and belongs to its species or race, varies within certain limits. This variation so runs through organic nature that we are told that there are no two leaves on a single tree exactly alike. Such variation is of two sorts: First, variations in degree, or relatively minute, fluctuating variations which may or may not be transmissible by heredity; secondly, variations in kind, or great and sudden variations, also called "mutations." It is these latter which are most fruitful for evolution, as they persist in the stock. The causes of these variations are not yet well understood, but the evident result is that individuals are born unequal; for some individuals vary in favorable directions, others in unfavorable directions. Some are born strong, some weak; some inferior, some superior.

It is evident that variation characterizes the human species quite as much as other species, and indeed the limits of variation are wider, probably, in the human species than in any other species. Man is the most variable of all animals, and human individuality and personality owe not a little of their distinctiveness to this fact. No more in human society than in the animal world are individuals born alike, or with equal natural endowments. From a biological point of view there is no truth in the old belief that all men are born equal. It is only in a moral sense that we may hold that men are equals.

(4) *The Struggle for Existence.* Individuals in all species, as we have seen, are born in larger numbers than is necessary. The result is that a competition is entered into between species and between individuals within the species for place and for existence. This competition or struggle results in the dying out of the inferior, that is, of those who are not best adapted to their environment. The gradual dying out of the inferior or unadapted through competition leaves for survival only the superior or better adapted, and ultimately only the fittest or those most adapted. Thus the type is raised, and we have evolution through natural selection, that is, through the elimination of the unfit.

Some have thought that this struggle for existence which is so evident in the animal world does not take place in human society. This, however, is a mistake. The struggle for existence in human society is not an unmitigated one, as it seems to be very often in the animal world, but it is nevertheless a struggle which has the same consequences. In the human world the competition, except in the lower classes, is not so much for food as it is for position and for supremacy. But this struggle for place and power in human society results in the weak and inferior going to the wall, and therefore ultimately in their elimination. In all essential respects, then, the struggle for existence goes on in human society as it does in the animal world. This means that in society, as in the animal world, progress depends upon the elimination of the unfit. The unfit in human society, as we shall see, are especially those who cannot adapt them-

selves to the requirements of progress. Progress in society, in a certain sense, waits upon death, as it does in all the rest of the animal world. Death is the means by which the stream of life is purged of its inferior and unfit elements.

Under conditions of peace, however, natural selection in human society works mainly through failure to reproduce. Its operation is therefore lethal and painless in any given generation. It is the differential birth rate, in other words, which chiefly determines, in conditions of peace, the numbers, and so the survival, of families, classes, nations, and races. Failure to reproduce by the more highly cultured elements thus slows down progress. This problem is so important that it will be considered at length later.

The human struggle for existence is illustrated in the world of human industry. Not only do individuals lose place and power because they are unadapted to their environment, but also economic groups, such as corporations, show the natural competition or struggle for existence sometimes in its most intense form. The result in all cases is the weeding out of the least adapted and the survival of the better adapted. Thus through competition and the survival of the better adapted is secured in industry the evolution of high types of industrial organization, industrial methods, and the like, just as higher types are secured in the same way in the animal world. But in economic matters as in other social affairs co-operation continually comes in to modify competition and to lift it to a higher plane.

A word of caution is perhaps necessary against confusing the economic struggle as it exists in modern society with the natural struggle under primitive conditions. It is evident that in present society the economic struggle has been greatly changed in character from the primitive struggle, and therefore can no longer have the same results. Laws of inheritance, of taxation, and many other artificial economic conditions have greatly interfered with the natural struggle. The rich and economically successful are, therefore, by no means to be confused with the biologically fit. On the contrary many of the economically successful are such simply through advantageous

artificial circumstances, and from the standpoint of biology and sociology they are often among the less fit, rather than the more fit, elements of society.

(5) *Another Factor in Organic Evolution is Co-operation*, or altruism. As Henry Drummond said, this is the struggle not for one's own life but for the lives of others. Really, however, it is a device which enables a group of individuals to struggle more successfully with the adverse factors in their environment. Something of co-operation—that is, a group of individuals carrying on a common life—is found almost at the beginning of life, and as we rise in the scale of animal creation, the amount of co-operation and of altruistic feelings which accompany it very greatly increases. Perhaps the chief source of this co-operation is to be found in the rearing of offspring. The family group, even in the lower animals, seems to be the chief source of altruism. At any rate, sympathetic or altruistic instincts grow up in all animals, probably chiefly through the necessities of reproduction.

It is only in human social life that co-operation, or altruism, attains its full development. Human society is characterized by the protection it affords to its weaker members, and in human society the natural process of eliminating the inferior often seems reversed. As Huxley pointed out, human society tries to fit as many as possible to survive, and it should be added, not only to survive, but to live well. Altruism and its resulting co-operation have come especially to characterize human social evolution. To some extent this is due, no doubt, to the necessities of group survival; for only that nation, for example, can survive that can maintain the most loyal citizenship, the best institutions, and the largest spirit of self-sacrifice in its members. Human social groups, therefore, try to fit as many individuals as possible for the most efficient membership, and this necessitates caring for the temporarily weak, and also for the permanently incapacitated, in order that the sentiments of social solidarity may be strengthened to their utmost.

It is evident, then, that all the factors at work in organic evolution are at work also in social evolution, though in some part modified and varying in

degree. The struggle for existence in human society, for example, has been greatly modified from the condition in the early animal world, while co-operation, or altruism, is much more highly developed. Nevertheless, the factors of organic evolution are at work in social evolution and must be taken into full account by the student of social problems. Social evolution rests upon organic evolution.

The Origin of Society.—Social evolution is rooted in the necessities of organic existence. By biological necessity most species of animals live in groups. The processes of both nutrition and reproduction in all higher forms of life involve more or less association of members of the same species. The association of the sexes and of parents and offspring is necessary among higher animals for the reproduction, care, and rearing of offspring. Among these, too, some degree of association is usually necessary for the procuring of an adequate food supply and for protection against enemies. Thus the basis of social evolution has been this necessary interdependence among organisms of the same species in the organic processes of life. Life, then, has never developed in an isolated way, each individual by himself. From the very start there has been unity, group life, among individuals of the same species.

The Origin of Human Society. We have already noted that there are vast differences between human society and animal association. What has just been said applies to social evolution in general and not specifically to the origin of human society. What, then, is the origin of human society? The only reply that can be given is that it is an evolution from animal association. Despite the great differences between animal association and human society, the only scientific conclusion which can be reached is that human society has been developed through long ages of selection. What makes human society distinct and peculiar in itself, indeed, is culture. Upon the two great differences between man and the other animals, articulate speech and the power of abstract thought, rest culture and all the distinctive features of human society. When we examine human social organization carefully, we find in it the same instinctive elements which we

find in the higher animals; but, in addition, we find many higher intellectual elements such as language, self-consciousness, morality, religion, and all the other products of man's higher intellectual faculties. Peculiar human instincts may give human society a different character to some extent, but this distinctive character is more largely attributable to man's higher intellectual development.

The Struggle for Existence in Human Society.—From the very beginning there has been no such thing as unmitigated individual struggle among animals. Nowhere in nature does pure individualism exist in the sense that the individual animal struggles alone, except perhaps in a few solitary species which are apparently on the way to extinction. The assumption of such a primitive individual struggle has been at the bottom of many erroneous views of human society. The primary conflict is between species. A secondary conflict, however, is always found between members of the same species. Usually this conflict within the species is a competition between groups. The human species exactly illustrates these statements. Primitively its great conflict was with other species of animals. The supremacy of man over the rest of the animal world was won only after an age-long conflict between man and his animal rivals. While this conflict was going on there was apparently but little struggle within the species itself. The lowest groups of which we have knowledge, while continually struggling against nature, are rarely at war with one another. But after man had won his supremacy over nature and the population of groups increased so as to encroach seriously upon food supply, and even territorial limits of space, then the conflict between human groups which we call war broke out and became almost second nature to man. However, before we can understand how war arose between human groups, we must know something about primitive human history.

Primitive Human History. Anthropologists tell us that the whole history of man may be roughly divided into three stages—*savagery*, *barbarism*, and *civilization*. Savagery was the stage in which man was a mere child of nature, living off the wild fruits of the earth and the

animals he could kill and eat, making no attempt to control his own destiny. This collecting and hunting stage lasted for the race at least one hundred thousand years, anthropological evidence shows. To this day, some belated human groups still survive in it.

Barbarism was a transitional stage in which man began to cultivate the soil and to raise domestic animals. But he soon turned his attention to preying on his fellow man as an easier method of gaining a livelihood than the mastering of physical nature. This stage of preliterate agriculture began in Europe about seven or eight thousand years ago with the coming of Neolithic man.

Civilization in the strict sense began only with the invention of writing and with the keeping of historic records—with man's coming to self-consciousness and with his beginning of control or mastery over the mental and social elements in his life. Civilization in this strict sense is therefore a very recent development in social evolution. Its beginnings were not more than five thousand years ago for any people, and for most European peoples it is scarcely two thousand years old. No people has yet achieved anything like complete civilization; and among all peoples we find still surviving more or less of the typical institutions of barbarism.

There is considerable overlapping in the different stages of human culture. Most of the typical institutions of the barbaric stage survive in the earlier stages of civilization. Such institutions as slavery and fixed social castes we got rid of but very recently, while even today we are trying to rid ourselves of autocracy, class exploitation, and militarism. Militancy and predatoriness are among the chief traits of barbarism. Out of them grew its typical institutions, such as slavery, class exploitation, fixed social classes or castes, polygamy, ceremonial politeness, and barbarous class display.

In a scientific discussion of war the first thing to remember is the fact that anthropology shows that military institutions did not develop in human societies until the stage of barbarism or preliterate agriculture. The very conditions of primitive life were such as to necessitate comparative peace in human groups. Human populations

were too small and too scattered for serious conflicts. Their struggle was mainly with the brute world and with physical nature. The common assumption, still largely prevalent, that the primitive state of mankind was one of constant warfare has been completely discredited by the progress of anthropological knowledge. The most primitive peoples of which we have knowedge are essentially unwarlike. For example, the Veddas of Ceylon and the Eskimos of the Arctic coast of North America, two very primitive peoples in widely different environments, are among the most unwarlike peoples known. In other words, the peoples whom by a strange misnomer we call "savages" are found upon scientific investigation to be relatively peaceful; that is, they rarely engage in conflicts with other human groups. Thus disappears the dogma that war is a "natural" condition of mankind and with it the belief in the inevitability and universality of war as a social condition. But we know that war became habitual and prevalent among many peoples in the stage of barbarism.

At the advent of barbarism the beginnings of agriculture made possible an increased and stable food supply and consequently a large increase in population. The world was rapidly filled up. Peoples began to encroach upon one another's hunting grounds and food supplies. These new economic conditions led to numerous conflicts between groups. Then, as the brute world was largely subdued, human groups came to fear no enemies so much as other human groups. The groups which were most successful in warlike enterprise found that war was an easier method to obtain food and wealth than the slow and tedious methods of primitive agriculture. A selection was thus started among human groups on the basis of war, those having the greatest efficiency in warlike weapons or organization having the best chance of surviving. Thus war primitively arose from economic conditions, and it is remarkable how economic conditions have had a part in bringing about almost all the great wars in human history.

The Social Effects of War. Along with the obvious destructive effects of war have gone certain effects upon human social organiza-

tion and upon the evolution of human groups which we must note. War has been the chief agency of group selection among mankind in the past and as such it has had an immense effect upon human culture and human social evolution. Six chief effects should be noted, as follows:

(1) Intergroup wars gave rise to higher forms of social organization, because in such wars only those groups could succeed that were well organized, and especially only those that had competent leadership.

(2) Government, as we know it in history, was very largely an outcome of the necessities of this intergroup struggle, or war. As we have seen, the groups that were best organized, that had the most competent leadership, would stand the best chance of surviving. Consequently the war leader or chief soon came, through habit, to be looked upon as the head of the group in all matters. Moreover, the exigencies and stresses of war frequently necessitated giving the war chief supreme authority in times of danger, and from this, without doubt, arose despotism in all of its forms. The most primitive tribes are republican or democratic in their form of government; but it has been found that despotic forms of government rapidly develop where a people are continually at war with other peoples.

(3) A third result of war in early society was the creation of social classes. After a certain stage was reached groups tried not so much to exterminate one another as to conquer and absorb one another. This was, of course, after agriculture had been developed and slave labor had reached a considerable value. Under such circumstances a conquered group would be incorporated by the conquerors as a slave or subject class. Later, this enslaved class may have become partially free as compared with some more recently subjugated or enslaved classes, and several classes in this way could emerge in a group through war or conquest. Moreover, the presence of these alien and subject elements in a group necessitated a stronger and more centralized government to keep them in control, and this was again one way in which war favored a development of despotic governments. Later,

of course, economic conditions gave rise to classes, and to certain struggles between the classes composing a people.

(4) Not only were social and political organization and the evolution of classes favored by intergroup struggle, but also the evolution of morality. The group that could be most efficiently organized would be, other things being equal, the group which had the most loyal and most self-sacrificing membership. The group that lacked a group spirit, that is, strong sentiments of solidarity, and harmonious relations between its members, would be the group that would be apt to lose in conflict with other groups, and so its type would tend to be eliminated. The morality which war developed, however, was a narrow, or "group" morality; and it was autocratic rather than democratic. Thus while loyalty, mutual aid, and honor were enforced within the tribe, war encouraged the disregard of the rights of all outside; and while war developed habits of obedience, service, and self-sacrifice on the part of all members of the group, it led to the disregard of the life and personality of individuals.

(5) Another consequence of war among human groups has been the absorption of weaker groups and the growth of larger and larger political groups until in modern times a few great nations dominate the population of the whole world. That this was not the primitive condition, we know from human history and from other facts which indicate the disappearance of a vast number of human groups in the past. The earth is a burial ground of tribes and nations as well as of individuals. In the competition between human groups, only a few that have had efficient organization and government, loyal membership, and high standards of conduct within the group, have survived. Philologists estimate that for every living language there are twenty dead languages. Remembering that one language not infrequently stands for several groups with related cultures, we can get an inkling of the immense number of human societies that have perished in the past in this intergroup competition.

(6) Modern war is essentially a survival of barbarism. History shows that the area of peace, that is, of settling disputes by unwarlike

methods, has constantly enlarged. Groups which once resorted habitually to war to settle their disputes now no longer think of doing so because they are parts of a larger organization, a larger social unity, built up partly by the pressure of material interests, partly by widening civilization, and partly by broadening sympathy and good will. Observation shows that whether conflicting moral or material interests lead men to war depends upon their aims, standards, and previous habits. Sociologists in general are therefore practically unanimous in concluding that the real causes of war are always in the cultural conditions and social standards of peoples. Where the traditions of a people are nonmilitant, they begin no wars, no matter what the external geographic and economic conditions may be. On the other hand, with warlike *mores* the most trifling things may be occasions for war. Warlike *mores* arise and flourish under those economic, intellectual, and moral conditions which characterize the stage of barbarism. Hence the conclusion that war is a survival from the stage in which the tradition of force was dominant. What some of the changes are which are necessary to build up a permanently peaceful civilization will be dealt with more or less in the discussion of the best forms of social organization and the best methods of human progress. We must not in our desire for peace ignore the part which war has played in past human social evolution. Once war selected well the stronger, more efficient, more socialized human groups. But modern wars produce a "reversal of selection" in human society by killing off the socially fittest and tending to rebarbarize the moral standards of nations. We have left behind the stage of history when war can contribute to the building of civilization. War is now a disease of our civilization. Hence higher civilization must find a better way than war of deciding the competition between human groups.

Competition.—Even though war passes away entirely, nations can never escape competition. While the competition may not be upon the low and brutal plane of war, it will certainly go on upon the higher plane of commerce and industry and will probably be quite as decisive in the life of peoples in the future as war was in the past.

While the primary struggle within the human species has been in the historic period between nations and races, this is not saying, of course, that struggle and competition has not gone on within these larger groups. On the contrary, a continual struggle has gone on between classes, first perhaps of racial origin and later of economic origin. Also there is within the nation a struggle between parties and sects and sometimes between "sections" and communities. Usually, however, the competition within the nation is a peaceful one and does not come to bloodshed.

Again within each of these minor groups above mentioned struggle and competition in some modified form goes on between its members. Thus within a party or class there is apt to be a struggle or competition between factions. There is, indeed, no human group that is free from struggle or competition between its members, unless it be the family at its best.

Competition and Co-operation. Evidently, competition and co-operation are twin principles in the evolution of social groups. While competition characterizes in the main the relation between groups, especially independent political groups, and while co-operation characterizes in the main the relation of the members of a given group to one another, still competition and co-operation are correlatives in practically every phase of the social life. Some degree of competition, for example, has to be maintained by every group between its members if it is going to maintain high standards of efficiency or of loyalty. If there were not competition with respect to the matters that concern the inner life of groups, the groups would soon lose efficiency in leadership and membership and would sooner or later be eliminated.

It follows from this that competition and co-operation are equally important in the life of society. It has been a favorite idea that competition among human beings should be done away with, and that co-operation should be substituted to take its place entirely. It is evident, however, that this idea is impossible of realization. If a social group were to check all competition between its members, it would stop thereby the process of natural selection or of the elimination of

the unfit, and, as a consequence, would soon cease to progress. If some scheme of artificial selection were substituted to take the place of natural selection, it is evident that competition would still have to be retained to determine who were the fittest. A society that would give positions of trust and responsibility to individuals without imposing some competitive test upon them would be like a ship built partly of good and partly of rotten wood,—it would soon go to pieces.

What people may rightfully object to is, not competition, but unregulated or unfair competition. In the interest of solidarity, that is, in the interest of the life of the group as a whole, all forms of competition in human society should be so regulated that the rules governing the competition may be known and the competition itself public. It is evident that in politics and in business we are very far from this ideal as yet, although society is unquestionably moving toward it.

The Necessity of Selection in Society.—This leads us to note well the continued necessity of selection in society. No doubt natural selection is often a brutal and wasteful means of eliminating the weak in human societies, and no doubt human reason might devise superior means of bringing about the selection of individuals which society must maintain. To some extent it has done this through systems of education and the like, which are, in the main, selective processes for picking out the most competent individuals to perform certain social functions. But the natural competition, or struggle between individuals, has not been done away with, especially in economic matters, and it is evidently impossible to do away with it until some vast scheme of artificial selection can take its place. Such a scheme is so far in the future that it is hardly worth talking about. The best that society can apparently do now is to regulate competition between individuals, and this it is doing increasingly.

The Sociological View of Morality.—In conclusion let us consider the nature of moral codes and standards from the social point of view. It is evident that moral codes from the social point of view are formulations of standards of conduct which groups find it convenient

or necessary to impose upon their members. Even morality, in an idealistic sense, seems from a sociological standpoint to be those forms of conduct which conduce to the harmony, to the efficiency, and so to the survival of humanity. Groups, however, as has already been pointed out, cannot do as they please. They are always hard pressed in competition by other groups and have to meet the standards of efficiency which nature imposes. Morality, therefore, is not anything arbitrarily designed by the group, but is a standard of conduct which necessities of social survival require. In other words, the right, from the point of view of social science, is that which ultimately conduces to survival, not of the individual, but of the group or of the species. This is looking at morality, of course, from the sociological point of view, and in no way denies the religious and metaphysical view of morality, which may be equally valid from a different standpoint.

Limits of Freedom or Variation in Human Society.—Finally, we need to note that biological factors do not necessitate in any mechanical sense certain conduct on the part of individuals or groups. Rather, natural selection marks the limits of variation which nature permits, and within those limits of variation there is a large amount of freedom of choice, both to individuals and to groups. Human societies, therefore, may be conceivably free to take one of several paths of development at any particular point. But in the long run they must conform to the ultimate conditions of survival; and this probably means that the goal of their evolution is largely fixed for them. Human groups are free only in the sense that they may go either backward or forward on the path which the conditions of survival mark out for them. They are free to survive or to perish. But social evolution in any case, in the sense of social change either toward higher or toward lower social adaptation, is a necessity that cannot be escaped. Sociology and all social science, therefore, are concerned chiefly with a study not of what human groups would like to do, but of what they must do in order to survive, that is, how they can control their environment by utilizing the laws which govern social evolution.

Summary.—From this brief and most elementary consideration of the bearings of evolutionary theory upon social problems it is evident that evolution, in the sense of what we know about the development of life and society in the past, must be one guidepost of the sociologist. Human social evolution, let us remember, rests upon and is conditioned by biological evolution. There is, therefore, scarcely any sanity in sociology without the biological point of view. However, overemphasis upon the biological factors leads to the belittling and neglect of psychological and cultural factors. In fact, it views human social evolution as dominated, like that of animal groups, by the factors in organic evolution.

But social evolution must not be confused with organic evolution. Human social evolution is essentially cultural, hence psychic; and organic evolution is only its basis.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Psychology of Human Society*, Chap. II.
CONKLIN, E. G., *The Direction of Human Evolution*, New Ed., Part I.
JENNINGS, H. S., *The Biological Basis of Human Nature*, Chaps. VIII, XV, XVI.
SCHEINFELD, A., *You and Heredity.*
YOUNG, K., *Source Book for Sociology*, Chap. IV.

For more extended reading:

BERNARD, L. L., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. I, II, X-XXI.
BOAS, F. and Others, *General Anthropology*, Chaps. I-III.
CONKLIN, E. G., *Heredity and Environment*, Sixth Ed., Chaps. IV, VI.
CONN, H. W., *Social Heredity and Social Evolution*, Chap. I.
DARWIN, C., *Descent of Man*, Chaps. I-V.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Cultural Evolution*, Chaps. I-II.
HANKINS, F. H., *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 2nd Ed., Chaps. IV-IX.
KELLOGG, V., *Darwinism Today.*
KROEBER, A. L., *Anthropology*, Chaps. I-IV.

MARETT, R. R., *Anthropology*, Chaps. I-III.
OGBURN, W. F., and NIMKOFF, M. F., *Sociology*, Chaps. I-III.
OSBORN, H. F., *Men of the Old Stone Age.*
SPILLER, G., *Origin and Nature of Man*, Chaps. III-V.
SUTHERLAND, R. L., and WOODWARD, J. L., *Introductory Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chap. III.
THOMSON, J. A., *Darwinism and Human Life.*
THOMSON and GEDDES, *Evolution.*
THORNDIKE, E. L., *Human Nature and the Social Order.*
WILDER, H. H., *Man's Prehistoric Past.*
WINSTON, S., *Culture and Human Behavior*, Chap. II.

On religious aspects of evolution:

CONKLIN, E. G., *The Direction of Human Evolution*, New Ed., Part III.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Reconstruction of Religion*, Chap. III.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Christianity and Social Science*, Chap. II.
FISKE, J., *The Destiny of Man.*
FISKE, J., *Through Nature to God.*
McDOUGALL, W., *Modern Materialism and Emergent Evolution.*

On geographical factors:

BOWMAN, I., *Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences.*
POMFRET, J. E., *The Geographical Pattern of Mankind.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What do we mean by "evolution"?
2. What is the Darwinian theory of descent?
3. What bearing does it have upon social theory?
4. What are the different lines of proof upon which it rests?
5. What is the general theory of universal evolution?
6. What are the different phases of universal evolution? What are the active principles in each of these phases, and how do they work?
7. How is social evolution related to organic evolution?
8. What are the factors in organic evolution? Show that they are each at work in present human society.

9. What effect has organic evolution had upon the individual?

10. How is mental evolution related to organic evolution?

11. What do we mean by "the struggle for existence" in human society, and what is its nature?

12. What have been some of the beneficial effects of war upon human social evolution in the past? Is this a good argument for the continuance of war?

13. Discuss the relation of competition and co-operation in social evolution. Is it wise or possible to substitute co-operation entirely for competition?

14. Why is the continuance of biological selection necessary in human society? Illustrate.

15. Does such selection rigidly determine social activities and social development?

16. How did animal association probably originate?

17. How did the food process have a part in originating group life? How did the process of defense? the reproductive process?

18. What is the relation of human society to animal association?

19. What is the distinctive feature of human society which marks it off from animal association? To what is this due?

20. What traits especially distinguish man as an individual from the lower animals? What effects have these had upon his social evolution?

21. Give a concise explanation of the relation of organic to human social evolution.

For classroom discussion:

1. Is the understanding of biological facts and forces necessary for the understanding of human relations?

2. Is evolution a fact or merely a theory?

3. Why is a knowledge of heredity important for understanding human relations? What is heredity?

4. What sort of evolution is mankind undergoing—biological, mental, or cultural? What is "culture" in the scientific sense?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Which is more important in population for social progress, heredity (*i.e.*, racial qualities) or geographic environment?

CHAPTER III

THE BEARING OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY UPON SOCIAL PROBLEMS

WHEN mind or consciousness appeared in organic evolution the whole balance of the world of life was changed. Thereafter the determining factors in the life process became more and more the inner and mental, not the outer and physical. Accordingly, to understand human society we must understand something of the mental life of man, for the interactions of individuals in human society are chiefly interactions of their thoughts, feelings, and will. Hence, psychology, the science of our mental life, must be the immediate basis of a large part of sociology. Knowledge of the psychology of human conduct, of behavior, is accordingly indispensable to the student of sociology.

Modern Psychology.—The earlier developments of psychological science laid a great deal of stress upon the analysis of the structure or content of the individual mind, that is, upon the analysis of the states of consciousness into their constituent elements. While this part of psychology is recognized to be of very great importance for the understanding of the mind in itself, it is not so important to the sociologist, for he deals with the person in action. What the sociologist needs is a science of the mind in action. This is usually called functional psychology. It deals with individual human conduct or behavior in the widest sense, thus furnishing the basis for explaining the interactions of individuals and the evolution of social organization.

Modern psychology is in its point of view broadly biological; that is, according to modern psychology, mind is not something apart from life, but is a functioning element in the life process. It is subject, like everything else in life, therefore, to the laws of organic evolution

which are discussed in Chapter II. The fundamental attributes of our mental life are not acquired by the individual in his lifetime, but are as much determined by natural selection as the general characteristics of our bodies. Thus our impulses, our feelings, desires, and interests so far as they are inborn are in the long run determined by natural selection. The thought of evolution thus dominates modern psychology as well as modern biology and sociology; but it must be borne in mind, of course, that natural selection is merely the elimination of the least favorable variations and is thus a framework within which a very large amount of free variation is possible; and that only very indirectly has natural selection anything to do with the habits which the individual acquires within his lifetime.

The Function of the Mind.—All biologists and psychologists are agreed that the brain is primarily an adaptive organ. Now, whatever may be the exact relation of mind and body, this means that the function of those higher neural processes which involve consciousness is primarily to aid the organism in adaptation, especially when the process is rapid and complex. Mental processes, in other words, are chiefly concerned with the guidance and control of complex activities. Not all bodily activities or acts are accompanied by consciousness; but wherever the purely physiological mechanism is insufficient to secure the proper adaptation of the organism to its environment, then consciousness appears, to control and direct movement. All the aspects of the mind present themselves, therefore, from one point of view, as devices to secure the superior adaptation of the organism to the environment. As Professor Angell said, "Mind seems to be the master device by means of which the adaptive operations of organic life may be made more perfect."

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the mind is concerned merely with the passive adaptation of the organism to the environment, that is, bending and shaping activities to meet the requirements of the environment. On the contrary, in its higher development the mind is equally concerned with the adaptation of the environment to the needs of the organism. This results from what is

known as the spontaneity or self-activity of the organism. The old conception of human nature, namely, that the individual is passive with reference to his environment and that his behavior is entirely determined by environmental stimuli, is quite entirely given up by modern biology and psychology. The new conception is that the organism is essentially active, that it is a relatively independent center of energy whose activities are directed to sustaining and maintaining itself. These activities of the organism spring from its own organic needs, such as nutrition and reproduction, and are directed to the satisfying of those needs. Accordingly, the immediate sources of activity must be sought within the organism and not outside. Activities or actions spring from the physiological impulses within the individual organism. And the higher we ascend in the animal scale, the more pronounced becomes this tendency to expend energy, which biologists call the catabolic tendency. Hence, the act begins within in the physiological impulse, but the development of the act depends upon the stimuli which the environment affords.

Now, it follows that the organism is not to any such extent in subjection to its environment as the older social theorists supposed. No activity could develop, to be sure, without some stimulus from the environment. The organism is, therefore, conditioned by the environment in the development and continuance of its activities. But the beginning of the activity is in the self-activity of the organism, and the stimulus which is attended to is selected by the organism from among a countless number. Only indirectly, therefore, through natural selection and acquired habit, is the individual organism in subjection to its environment. Natural selection has fixed in us certain innate or hereditary reactions to stimuli, but even these are not hard and fast in man and the higher animals; while acquired habits create certain pathways in the nervous system which establish learned reactions. But in man conscious choice plays a leading part in determining what habits the individual shall have.

The mind is, therefore, essentially purposive and selective in its workings. Its function is to select, from among the stimuli which sur-

round an organism, those which are needful for the maintenance and development of its activities. The basis of this selection is the inner organization of the organism, that is, its instincts and acquired habits. Thus it builds up the activities which are needful for maintaining and developing life. The mind presents itself, therefore, as a delicate apparatus for mastering the environment. In the highest development of mental life the subjection to the environment becomes less and less; that is, the power of transforming the environment becomes greater and greater. This is the case with man. It is by might of intelligence that he has conquered the world.

Bearing in mind the fact that the environment to which the human individual has to adapt himself is above all a social environment of other individuals and that the social life consists of a series of complex reciprocal relations or adaptations between individuals, the social significance of the mind becomes manifest. It is evident that the function of the human mind is especially to adjust individuals to one another in a common life, to act as a link between individuals, and to further their better mutual adaptation to one another in the process of living together.

Different levels or aspects of the functioning of the mind in human behavior are conveniently distinguished for the sake of clearness in psychological and sociological analysis. These are the instinctive, the habitual, the feeling, the intelligent, and the rational levels. All of these are found in human social behavior.

The Native Impulses, or the "Instincts."—First of all come those hereditary reactions which psychologists call the native impulses or the "instincts." In man, and in all of the higher animals, there is a highly developed nervous system with multitudes of connections between its elements. These are pathways for nervous currents. Now, many of these connections are inborn—are a part of our human heredity. Hence among our nervous reactions to external stimuli are certain reactions more or less definitely preorganized by heredity. The larger part of these preorganized reactions have been fixed in the species through the operation of natural selection in the

same way in which the bodily characteristics of the species have been established. These the psychologists call the "instincts," or native impulses, or hereditary reactions.

These reactions are not acquired by the individual, but are the psychological expression, on the side of behavior, of his racial heredity, and like other inborn traits are transmitted from generation to generation with but little variation. In man, however, the "instincts" differ from those of the lower animals. Not only has man more "instincts" on account of the more complex hereditary structure of his nervous system, but for this reason they are more variable and alterable. In many of the lower forms of life, such as the insects, the instincts give rise to very fixed forms of behavior. In man there are few, if any, such fixed forms of behavior due to instinct, owing to his much more complex hereditary nervous structure and to the fact that the larger part of the connections in his nervous system are acquired during the lifetime of the individual. The "instincts" in man are variable also owing to individual differences in nervous structure. Again, in man those complex hereditary reactions which we term "instincts" pass through the higher nervous centers which are concerned with consciousness, and hence are more or less subject to those higher controls over behavior which we term "feeling" and "intelligence." Finally, natural impulses get their development only through appropriate stimuli in the environment, and therefore their expression is largely controlled by man's artificial environment, the culture of his group. For all of these reasons those activities which predominantly spring from heredity are more modifiable and alterable in man through experience than in any other animal.

Nevertheless, because inborn impulses furnish the nucleus of activities by which the individual begins to master his world, and because all later adaptations are more or less influenced by these original reactions, they are exceedingly important as the basis of man's mental and social life. They are the activities which do not need to be learned, but are in us apart from training and experience by virtue of our human heredity.

The "instincts" are the origin of certain simpler relations between individuals and so furnish the beginnings of social organization. This may be seen in such typical human instincts as sexual and parental love. Other typical "instincts" usually recognized by psychologists are gregariousness, imitativeness, constructiveness, acquisitiveness, self-assertion, combativeness, and curiosity. All of these are sufficiently in evidence in human society. It should be pointed out, however, that there is no single "social instinct" which can be invoked to explain the origin, much less the development, of man's social life, since many instincts must have been concerned in bringing and keeping individuals together even in the primitive forms of association. Nevertheless, sociability itself must be considered an instinctive rather than an acquired trait. Human society, then, is rooted in "human instincts," and the instincts are at the basis of man's social as well as of his mental life.

Accordingly, sociology must always seek, beneath habits, customs, and traditions in society, the original instinctive impulses and reactions of individuals. Since these represent the innate or biological element, and furnish the original basis for the relationships of individuals, they may well be characterized as the primary social forces. No program of social reconstruction can possibly succeed which does not take into consideration these original tendencies of human nature; on the other hand, when their control is understood, they will present no insuperable obstacle to any rational program of social reconstruction. Hence the guidance and control of these native reactions through the education of the individual and through the appropriate organization of social life is one of the great practical problems of human society.

Acquired Habits.—Instincts are inborn, while habits are acquired. Instincts might perhaps be termed race habits, while habits in the strict sense are modifications of inherent activities acquired by individuals or groups of individuals during their lifetime. As we have already seen, instinctive reactions become modified by experience; that is, the hereditary tendencies of the individual are adapted to new situations, and new ways of reacting are thus acquired. These

new ways of reacting, when they no longer need attention and drop more or less out of consciousness, become habits in the strict sense of the word. The earlier-formed habits become, of course, the basis for later ones through their modification by adaptation, just as instinctive reactions are modified. Thus are built up the countless habits of the mature individual. This process of building up habits out of "instincts" and previously formed habits, is from a psychological standpoint the essence of mental growth both in the individual and in society. Acquired habits in time come to be "second nature," as we say, and are not less powerful in determining conduct than the original instinctive reactions. This is as true of society as it is of the individual.

Acquired habit, therefore, plays a great part in human society. The character of the adult individual is very largely the result of the habits acquired through early environment and education. The organization of society is also at any given time almost wholly the result of habit; for social organization is the whole mass of reciprocal adjustments which individuals of a group maintain among themselves, and these are largely habitual. The psychological fact of habit is thus the main carrier of all those forms of social life and organization which rise above the merely instinctive level.

Thus habit forms the chief raw material for cultural evolution. Man's capacity to acquire an indefinite number of habits made it possible for him to take on civilization through building up social usages, customs, traditions, and institutions. All of these are forms of habit with varying degrees of social sanction attached to them. Usages, or "folkways," are simply the similar habits of a group of people, usually handed down from generation to generation. The "mores," or customs, of a people are the folkways which have been reflected upon and sanctioned by the group, and hence set up as standards. Institutions are simply more highly developed and systematized, more definitely sanctioned and established social habits; while social traditions are habitual ways of thinking and feeling handed down from generation to generation. Thus the social order

at any given time is largely a matter of habit, and the problem of its reconstruction is the problem of building up new habits adapted to new life conditions to replace old habits which are no longer adapted.

The mental and social life of man centers about the psychological facts of habit and adaptation. If we lived in a slowly changing world, we should need no other controls over activity than instinct and habit; but inasmuch as we live in a rapidly changing world we need the higher, inner forms of control over behavior which we call "feeling," "intelligence," and "rationality."

Feeling.—By feeling we mean the agreeable or disagreeable tone which accompanies conscious states. It is practically synonymous with pleasure and pain, using those words in a broad way. Feeling, then, is the "me-side" of activity, or, more accurately, it is the subjective valuation which the organism gives to an activity. When the activity is one which has on the whole in the past history of the organism been advantageous, the resulting feeling is usually pleasurable. On the other hand, when the activity is one which has been disadvantageous, the feeling is disagreeable or painful.

Feeling, because it is the me-side of activity, is subject to all the variations to which the individual organism is subject. Conditions of health, habit, and personal idiosyncrasies often make that which is agreeable to one person disagreeable to another. Hence, pleasure and pain are not good guides as to the rightness or wrongness of actions. The majority of our feelings are attached to our "instincts" in the form of emotions. They powerfully reinforce, therefore, the instinctive activities. Now, the "instincts," as we have already seen, are the result of selection in the past history of the species. They and the feelings attached to them, or the emotions, are not therefore good guides in the complex life of the present. Natural impulses, and their correlated emotions, need, therefore, to be controlled and guided by the reason. They are, however, rough monitors which indicate to us without the labor of thought the organically advantageous or disadvantageous.

A mistake of the psychology of the early part of the nineteenth century was its claim that pleasure and pain are the sole springs of action. But, as we have seen, feeling is the accompaniment and not the antecedent of activity. Feeling does, however, modify activity. If the feeling tone raised by the activity is pleasurable, the activity is reinforced, but if it is disagreeable or painful, the activity tends to be inhibited. This is, however, something very different from saying that pleasure and pain are the sole sources of activity.

It is important to realize that a large part of our instincts and emotions represent not high civilization, but the wild life which our ancestors lived many thousands of years ago. Hence impulse and emotion are today the great enemies of intelligence; and perhaps the main problem of civilization may be said to be to bring about the predominance of intelligence in human relations and in social behavior. Nevertheless, we have also to recognize that nothing great in the way of achievement is ever brought about in human society without the help of emotion. It becomes, therefore,very important that we learn to discriminate among our emotions, to discourage the baser ones, and to encourage the nobler ones. Such emotions as fear, pride, anger, tend to antisocial action, while the sympathetic emotions tend to develop behavior favorable to the development of the higher types of human relations, especially when they are guided by social intelligence.

It is evident that in securing changes in activities in human society it is well if possible to enlist the feelings on the side of those changes. This can best be done by connecting the change with some instinctive impulse. Now, the instinctive impulses which are most favorable to social betterment are the altruistic or sympathetic impulses. Hence it is that the sympathetic feelings can usually be appealed to in bringing about any reform or progressive change in society. Sympathy, by which we mean fellow feeling, or altruistic feeling, is, therefore, the aspect of feeling which is most socialized, and has most to do in furthering social reforms and the reconstruction of civilization upon a basis of justice and humanity. The appeal to feeling is justifiable in society, therefore, only when it is an appeal to

our sympathetic or altruistic feelings, and even these need the control of our intelligence. Nevertheless, sympathetic or altruistic feeling, because it tends to harmonize individuals in their relations and to establish mutual good will, must be regarded as one of the foundations of higher civilization.

Intelligence.—Intelligence is problem-solving ability. It is the side of the mind which has to do especially with the adaptation of the activities of the organism to the environment. Instinct and feeling have, as we have seen, chiefly reference to the organism and its past environment, while intelligence on the other hand is turned outward toward the rest of the universe, and so stands more for the present and the future. It functions to evaluate and control activities with reference to the environment. Knowledge, ideas, values, in other words, play the decisive role in adapting the organism to its environment.

It is probable that intelligence was developed as an aid in adapting instinctive tendencies to environmental conditions and in satisfying the demands of feeling. Nevertheless, in man it can and does act independently of these. The instincts and feelings, as we have already seen, are very insufficient guides in the complex social life of the present; hence the need of a higher instrument of adaptation than that which instinct or feeling can furnish. Therefore nature has developed in man the intellect, and the chief distinction between man and the lower animals is that he has passed through many more stages of intellectual development. Man's intellect has been developed, in other words, to control activities in individual and collective life which cannot be controlled in any other way. It is for this reason that man has developed a higher phase of intelligence which no other animal possesses, which we call the "reason" or "rationality."

Rationality.—Rationality is the power of the mind to solve problems by abstract thinking. In man it is the supreme device for controlling activity and modifying the environment. The power of abstract thought, of imagination and reasoning, has enabled man to build up a distinctive social life, characterized by "culture," or

"civilization." Language, religion, government, science, morality, and education, all these distinctive features of human society, as well as many others, have depended for their development upon this evolution of man's intellectual nature. While it is a mistake to search for primitive social origins in man's reason, or to think that human society is mainly a product of reflective thought, yet later social developments and movements take on more and more a rational character. Reflective thought, which probably played an insignificant part in primitive society, becomes in the highest social development the decisive element, because upon it depends the control, not only of the forces of physical nature, but also of the feelings and impulses of human nature.

All this is illustrated by the part which invention and discovery have played in social development. Invention and discovery hardly exist below the human level, hence animal societies are not progressive. On the other hand, civilization in human societies has been built up largely through invention and discovery. The invention of tools, weapons, laborsaving devices, the improvements in communication and transportation, along with scientific discovery of the properties and nature of things, have been the material means by which human progress has been effected. But it should be remembered that invention is not confined to the putting together of material forces in new ways, nor is discovery confined to the understanding of the workings of physical nature. Quite as important phases of invention and discovery have been the making of new institutions and forms of association, the discovery of new possibilities in human living, and especially the development of social standards by which individual and social activities have been standardized and controlled. Moral development in human society has depended, therefore, very largely upon intellectual processes. Moral ideas and ideals especially have exerted a powerful influence on social relationships. Since new ideas are the creation of exceptional minds, and, since they may become powerful instruments in social progress, it is evident that the individual has also his place as a factor in social evolution.

In the higher stages of social development, therefore, the human reason plays an increasingly important part. When we remember that all the achievements of science, all of the conquests of the practical arts, all man's mastery over nature and self, are products of his reason, we can scarcely deny the very large part which must be assigned to the intellect in human social evolution and progress. Hope for the social future, moreover, manifestly lies in the possibility of the increasing dominance of intelligence in our social life. Mastery over the conditions of our social existence can come only through increasing knowledge.

This means, in effect, that only science is adequate to guide the reconstruction of our social life. In proportion as we build our social life upon ascertained facts and laws of human living together, we shall be successful; in proportion as we build upon mere emotionalism, blind tradition, or party prejudices, we shall fail. Only in the development and maintenance of the rational level of behavior lie the safety and security of civilization.

The Social Character of Human Behavior, Feeling, and Thinking.—It is evident from what has been said, that the human mind as a whole enters as a determining and active factor into the social life of man. The forces at work in human relations consist not simply of feeling elements, such as wishes and desires, but also of all the impulses, whether hereditary or acquired, and all the intellectual elements which go to make up the mental life of the individual. We must, of course, not forget the influence of physical factors upon human social life, such as heredity, variation, and natural selection, and back of these the conditions of the physical environment, such as climate, soil, food, and other geographical conditions. The human mind is in interaction with all of these, although they manifest themselves chiefly in human social life through the psychological elements of impulse, feeling, and intelligence. But more important than these original factors in human social life are the acquired factors which come from the culture of the group and the accumulated experiences of individuals. It is, as has already been pointed out, the accumulation

of these factors which results in cultural evolution. They are all learned by experience and stored up in language and in other symbols. Thus human societies live, as we have already seen, not only by the experience of individuals but also by the stored-up experience of society itself, which is called the social or group tradition. The social tradition is, therefore, the main determining force in social behavior, and it is tradition which gives us, in the main, our ideas, sentiments, and values concerning social behavior. The student should, therefore, not fail to note that the greater part of the ideas, sentiments, and values of the individual are derived from his culture and usually from the social traditions of his group. The importance of tradition in determining, guiding, and controlling the forces at work in human society will have to be considered a little later, in the following section of this chapter.

Another fact which the elementary student in sociology should note is that the factors at work in our social life are very complex, and that it is impossible to interpret human society aright through paying attention to only one of these. Our views of the human social life must be broad enough, in other words, to include the working of all possible factors. The view of society which will be presented in this book, therefore, is a synthetic one, as opposed to the many one-sided theories which are now prevalent regarding human institutions.

Such a view we get even from a study of the individual mind, because such study shows that human consciousness is very largely a reflection of the complex social culture in which it has been developed, and that the mind itself is therefore socially conditioned in all of its aspects. This is true even of the "instincts" and emotions with which we are equipped by heredity, because careful study of human instincts shows that they presuppose a social medium for their evolution. Even our most abstract thought is in the nature of conversation, and therefore presupposes mental interaction, or society. Man's mental and social life are, therefore, largely one.

Mental interaction, intercommunication, is as necessary for the mind as for social life. As mind is the chief organ of adaptation for

individuals, so intercommunication is the means of adjustment between individual minds. Moreover, since we learn chiefly from one another, the whole mental life and social life grow together. Human society is therefore modifiable through modifying the mentality of its individuals. Through intercommunication society carries on a collective mental life, and the individual mind gets its development largely by participating therein.

These statements must not be interpreted to mean that the individual's mental life is wholly submerged in that of his group. Biological variation and the self-active character of the individual prevent this. So far as science can discover there is no complete social determinism of individual consciousness and behavior. While the individual gets his development, both physical and psychical, in the main, from his connection with a larger life, the life of his species and of his group, this does not prevent him from developing variations of his own, both physically and mentally. If this were not so, social progress would be impossible, save through the action of natural selection upon groups. As it is, the individual's variations, originalities, and inventions may be taken up by the group through communication, suggestion, and imitation and become the acquired habits of the whole group. Thus the individual reacts upon his group. Human society is, then, not a simple mass, but is made up of relatively independent, autonomous individuals. The key to its activities is not, therefore, in some principle which simply applies to the mass as a whole, but rather in the laws and principles of individual behavior.

Social Tradition.—So far as there is a single key to understanding the social behavior of men, it lies in the concepts of culture, and social tradition. Social tradition is the subjective side of culture, passed along by various forms of communication. It includes all the ideas, sentiments, and values connected with industry, government, law, art, science, religion, morality, education, and all other human institutions. It is dominantly a way of thinking and of feeling handed down from generation to generation, while custom is the way of doing thus handed down. The chief vehicle of tradition is oral and

written language. Football, for example, is a tradition in our society so far as its rules, standards, and values have been embodied in oral and written speech. The actual playing of the game is a custom. Together, as we have already seen, custom and tradition make up the culture of the group. But tradition is the main element in culture, for the patterns of action and the values embodied in tradition are what sustain all social customs. These patterns of action, lodged in the minds of individuals, become the standard by which the members of a human group measure and control their behavior. Hence, individual behavior is of a high or low type according to the tradition of the group. Democratic behavior, for example, cannot be preserved without a strong democratic tradition.

Tradition is what makes the continuity of human society. It makes its historical continuity. All civilization is due to the development of traditions. Thus the traditions of law and government have gradually accumulated and been refined. So also the traditions of our religion and morality. Science, itself, is a splendid example of the nature and importance of tradition. For all of the knowledge of science, except the little which is being added at the present, is tradition. Yet scientific knowledge is becoming increasingly the basis for wise social adjustments. It is the sociological fact of the power of social tradition which makes students of human social behavior confident that the possibilities of social adjustment and social achievement have not yet been explored. A family, a football team, or a regiment may, through the power of its traditions, shape and mold the behavior of its individual units, even though the personnel of a group changes. Thus one key to social adjustment is group tradition. The same human group may take on ways of barbarism or of high civilization, may become autocratic and militaristic, or democratic and peaceful, according to the social tradition which it accepts and fosters.

Human groups are generally careful to preserve and pass along their traditions, because this is the surest way of preserving the acquired uniformities of social behavior. Sometimes traditions are passed along, however, without expressing themselves clearly in corresponding cus-

toms. Thus it might be doubted if the traditions of Christianity and democracy, for example, have ever been adequately embodied in the corresponding customs in our social life. We must remember that traditions are embodied in words and that sometimes words fail to result in appropriate actions. Empty traditions, if we may so term them, are possible in human groups.

A more frequent danger in group traditions, however, is when they become hard and fast and unchangeable. This brings about a state of society which we may call "traditionalism"; that is, human groups may be so much in favor of certain traditions as to oppose any change in the ideas, sentiments, or values which underlie government, law, religion, morals, or education, no matter how rational the proposed change may be. Inflexible traditions are very manifestly a danger to the social group in which they exist, for change is the law of life for groups as well as for individuals. Therefore, while all human societies live by their traditions, yet they should avoid traditionalism, and this holds for all their institutions. Perhaps science has given us the best example of how to proceed in this matter; for science, while it adheres to all the truth which has been established in the past, yet looks forward to the discovery of new truth and new knowledge which will enable man to make superior adjustments with his environment and with his fellow men.

The social tradition is so potent in determining group behavior that some sociological writers have called group tradition, plus public opinion, "the group mind." The word "mind" however, had better be reserved for the mental processes of the individual.

The Learning Process in Human Society.—It has been implied that the higher forms of social behavior in human groups are determined largely by what the group has learned. Educational psychologists recognize three main forms of learning by individuals: by conditioning responses, whether impulsive or habitual; by imitation; and finally by insight. These are the three types of learning by individuals, and, of course, they all manifest themselves in learning by groups. However, human groups learn mainly, as we have seen, by

intercommunication. Animals learn by the sensory and muscular exploration of objects. But man's main method of learning seems to be learning from other members of his group through some form of intercommunication, especially verbal language. In ordinary speech we call this "learning from others." All the customs and traditions of human groups are learned in this way, and these customs and traditions constitute the bulk of all that is learned by human beings. Human beings learn, in other words, not so much by doing or even by private concrete experience, as by intercommunication and social imagination.

As learning accumulates in human groups and is stored in language in its various forms and in other symbols, it becomes the basis of tradition and custom, and so of the whole rule of life for the groups of mankind. Such "interlearning" among the members of human groups becomes in mankind the main factor in his cultural and social life, and so the main determinant of human social behavior. Through such "interlearning" it is possible for groups of men to profit from the experience, the inventions, and the discoveries of a single individual. Thus social leadership becomes very important in guiding human social behavior. Unless we remember this principle of learning from others and especially from leaders, we shall scarcely be able to understand the behavior of human groups or to get a foundation for a constructive sociology, constructive educational theory, and constructive social science in general. As human society secures its development through a learning process, this is the reason why human social behavior is modifiable, and why we have reason to believe that there are possibilities of indefinite improvement in that behavior. However, it is well to remember that human groups, like individuals, may commit errors by learning to act unwisely.

Social Control.—Human societies undertake more or less consciously to shape and mould the habits, the desires, the beliefs, and the ideals of their members, so that their activities may be easily and advantageously co-ordinated with those of the whole group. This is what is called "social control." Except in its simplest forms, group

action is impossible without some degree of control by the group over the individual. Human societies, therefore, show the phenomena of authority and of social discipline. If individual behavior varies too greatly from the standards of the group, the individual is punished. From childhood to the grave the individual is surrounded by social rewards and penalties to get him to conform his behavior to that of his group. This is done through a number of agencies and institutions which exert upon the individual what has been called "social pressure." These agencies of control may be classified under such heads as government, law, religion, moral ideals, and education, but we should not forget group opinion and social ostracism. In high civilization these agencies and institutions are the chief means of controlling the activities of individuals, and they probably have more to do with the formation of the habits and ideas of individuals in highly civilized groups than all other influences, objective and subjective, combined. In a word, order and unity in vast complex human groups is achieved through institutional authority and pressure and through other specialized agencies for social control.

The Original Factors in Human Relations.—Let us now briefly reconsider what has been said in this and in the preceding chapter about the active factors or forces which enter into and affect human relations. From the start, even in the most primitive times, these factors were complex. The evolutionary point of view makes it impossible to leave out physical and biological factors. There were also original psychical factors at work even in the earliest human groups, such as hereditary impulses, the primary emotions, and primary intellectual elements. These have continued to work, as we have seen, even in present human relations. They have, however, been overlaid, and to a great extent controlled, by more complex factors or forces, usually derived from the culture of the group. Hence in interpreting definite human group behavior, the sociologist must always keep in the background these original social forces, the geographical, the biological, the instinctive, the emotional, and the primary intellectual elements.

The original factors in human relations, then, are those furnished by physical nature and original human nature. The derived factors are compounded out of these simple original factors, and most of them are products of human culture. The original factors may be classified as follows:

I. *The physical factors:*

(a) Geographic environment, including climate, food, soil, natural resources, topography, etc.
(b) Biological forces, heredity, variation, selection, etc.

II. *The psychical factors:*

(a) Impulses, both hereditary (instinctive) and acquired (habitual).
(b) Feelings, both hereditary (emotions) and acquired (habitual).
(c) Intellectual elements, including sensation, perception, and ideation (conception, imagination, reasoning, etc.)

The Derived Social Forces.—In the past there has been much discussion among sociologists as to the nature of social forces and their classification. The word "force" belongs to the physical sciences and had probably better not be used in the social sciences, as it implies a false analogy. Many sociologists have found the determining factors in human association to be the "desires" or "wishes" of human individuals. Thus Professor W. I. Thomas finds that there are four fundamental desires which characterize all men and which he thinks are adequate to explain human social behavior. These four fundamental desires are: (1) the desire for new experience, (2) the desire for security, (3) the desire for recognition, (4) and the desire for response. These "desires" or "wishes" hardly furnish an exhaustive list of fundamental universal human wishes. Moreover, for the most part, they need to be explained. So far as they are not original human impulses, they are largely products of culture, and this is true of most human desires and wishes, which are compounded mainly out of feelings and impulses, frequently modified by cultural conditions. Explanations of

human social behavior through human desires, as, for example, economic behavior, may prove to be superficial and inadequate, because such explanation fails to see how the desires of the individual may be rooted in the culture of his group.

Practically the same is to be said about explanations of human social behavior in terms of the "interests" and "values" of human individuals. These are compounds built up out of feelings, impulses, and intellectual elements, but such feelings, impulses, and intellectual elements of individuals may be greatly modified by the culture of the group. The same thing is to be said of the "sentiments," which are complexes of feelings attached to some idea or object, and of enduring social attitudes which have been built up out of feelings, impulses, and habits. All of these are true factors in human relations and supply normally the motives for the reflective activities of civilized man. Through them the original psychic factors of impulses, feelings, and intelligence usually express themselves.

Many classifications of social values and interests have been proposed. Some of them have proved helpful, and some classification is a practical necessity in a discussion of the activities and institutions of human society. The late Professor Small proposed the following six-item classification of social interests and values: (1) health interests; (2) wealth or economic interests; (3) political and sociability interests; (4) intellectual or scientific interests; (5) aesthetic interests; (6) moral and religious interests. This classification does roughly indicate the main activities and pursuits of human groups. It is a sociological classification rather than a psychological one.

Most important of all classifications of active factors in civilized human society is the classification into material culture and nonmaterial, or spiritual, culture. Material culture includes all the modifications of the geographic environment created by human intelligence, such as tools, machines, roads, buildings, etc. This technological environment modifies and conditions all of the social behavior of civilized man, and at present furnishes many of the most potent stimuli and difficult problems involved in human social behavior.

But equally potent and important is the nonmaterial or spiritual side of culture, embodied in such agencies and institutions as government, law, art, science, religion, morality, and education. The complexes of institutional stimuli which are found under these heads furnish many of the chief factors to which attention must be paid in explaining human social behavior, and they will frequently concern us in the discussion of social problems.

Summary.—Social life is made up of adaptations between individuals, of coadaptations of individuals and groups to one another. But the master device for controlling the complex adaptations of life is the mind; hence mind is also the chief instrument for maintaining and perfecting that complex of adaptations between individuals and groups which is our social life. Human society is the creation of the mind of man and is therefore modifiable. Intercommunication is the chief means of making interadjustments between individuals and groups, just as the mind is the chief organ of adaptation in the individual. Hence all phases of social and mental life are intertwined. Back of these, however, we must recognize the physical and biological factors. But a sociology which is to be put to practical use must show the significance of the various mental factors for our social life; for it is these factors which can be most easily modified and controlled.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Psychology of Human Society*, Chap. III.
COOLEY, C. H., *Social Organization*, Chaps. I-II.
KUNKEL, F., and DICKERSON, R. E., *How Character Develops*, Chap. I.
PARK, R. E., and BURGESS, E. W., *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Chap. II.

For more extended reading:

BERNARD, L. L., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Part IV.
BOGARDUS, E. S., *Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, 3d Ed, Chaps. I-V.

BOGARDUS, E. S., *Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. II-IV.
COOLEY, C. H., *Human Nature and the Social Order*, Chaps. I-VI.
DEWEY, J., *Human Nature and Conduct.*
GROVES, E. R., *Personality and Social Adjustment*, Rev. Ed.
HART, H. N., *The Science of Social Relations*, Chaps. VI-X.
HOCKING, W. E., *Human Nature and Its Re-making*, Parts I-II.
KLINEBERG, O., *Social Psychology*, Part II.
LA PIERE, R. T., and FARNSWORTH, P. R., *Social Psychology*, 2nd Ed.
MCDOUGALL, W., *Introduction to Social Psychology*, Chaps. I-IV.
OGBURN, W. F. and NIMKOFF, M. F., *Sociology*, Chap. V.
REUTER, E. B., and HART, E. W., *Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. III, IV.
ROSS, E. A., *Social Psychology*, Chap. I.
SUTHERLAND, R. L., and WOODWARD, J. L., *Introductory Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. VII-VIII.
THORNDIKE, E. L., *Human Nature and the Social Order*, Chaps. I-II.
TROTTER, W., *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War.*
WALLAS, G., *The Great Society*, Chaps. II-XI.
WARDEN, C. J., *The Emergence of Human Culture*, Chaps. I-III.
WINSTON, S., *Culture and Human Behavior*, Chaps. I-III.
WISSLER, C., *Man and Culture*, Chap. XI.
WOODWORTH, R. S., *Psychology: A Study of Mental Life*, 4th Ed., Chaps. IV-VIII.
YOUNG, K., *Sociology, A Study of Society and Culture*, Chap. 3.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why does psychology have so much bearing upon sociology?
2. What do we mean by "mental life"?
3. What is the viewpoint of modern psychology?
4. How has organic evolution produced mental evolution?
5. What is the biological function of mind? What is its social function?
6. What do you understand by "original human nature," and why must we understand it in order to understand human society?
7. What four wrong views of human nature are prevalent? Criticize each. How do they lead to a wrong sociology? Illustrate.

8. Why can we not consider the individual as the victim of "the circumstances of his environment?"

9. What is the nature of the external stimulus? Can we regard it as the mechanical cause of action?

10. What is the nature of the reaction or response? Is it the effect of the stimulus?

11. What are the different levels of human behavior? What are the "controls" over each?

12. What do we mean by "instinct"? What is its influence in social life? Illustrate.

13. What is habit? What is its role in human society? Illustrate.

14. What is feeling? How does it affect the social life?

15. What is intelligence, and how does it function biologically?

16. In what particular respects has it affected the social life of man? Illustrate.

17. What is rationality? How has it affected human society? Illustrate.

18. How is it that human behavior is modifiable? Illustrate.

19. To what extent may the mind of the individual be regarded as a social product? Illustrate from human behavior.

20. What are the *original* active factors in human association?

21. What factors are derived from these? Define each one.

22. Give Small's functional classification of social values or "interests."

23. Why are man's mental life and social life so largely inseparable?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is "human nature"?

2. If we knew all about human nature would we know all about human relations?

3. What are some wrong views of human nature? Is the sensate view (*i.e.*, that man acts always to preserve or increase his pleasures) scientifically sound?

4. Can cultural forces (*i.e.*, social attitudes taught and learned) always control human nature?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Is intelligence or sympathy more necessary to secure well-adjusted human relations?

CHAPTER IV

PRIMARY GROUPS: THE FUNCTION OF THE FAMILY IN HUMAN SOCIETY

Types of Social Groups.—We may conveniently distinguish between different types of social groups or "forms of association." There is first of all the distinction between *temporary* and *permanent* groups. It is evident that the permanent groups are more important both practically and for the purposes of scientific study. The temporary groups, moreover, are usually parts of larger permanent groups.

Another distinction which should be made is that between *voluntary*, purposive groups and *involuntary*, genetic groups. The former are found only in human society and are associations of persons for special purposes, such as parties, religious sects, trade unions, industrial corporations, clubs, and the like. The latter are natural groupings, such as the family, the neighborhood, the city, the state or province, and the nation. They may be, and usually are, called *communities*, since they are composed of individuals who carry on all phases of a common life. Voluntary, purposive associations always exist within some community, whether large or small. Groups which we call "communities" are, therefore, more embracing, more stable, less artificial and specialized than purely voluntary groups. For this reason communities are of more interest to the sociologist than specialized voluntary groups, and sociology is in a peculiar sense a study of the problems of community life.

A still more important distinction between groups for sociological purposes is that between *primary* and *secondary* groups. Primary groups are those which involve more or less intimate, face-to-face, personal relations. Such are the family, the neighborhood, and the play group. Secondary groups, on the other hand, are those which do

not necessarily involve face-to-face association. Such are the state, the nation, the political party, and the religious sect. They are secondary because they are not original but are the creations of high civilization.

Primary groups, on the other hand, are found in all stages of human development. They are of most interest sociologically, because they exhibit social life at its maximum intensity, and because they are the bearers of the most vital elements in social life, especially the traditions of civilization.

Another very important distinction for sociological purposes among the forms of human association is that between the sanctioned, or *institutional*, and the unsanctioned, or *noninstitutional*, forms. Those groupings and relations of individuals which have been reflected upon, approved, and established, or *instituted*, by a large community we call institutions. Such are the family, property, the state, the church, and the school. As institutions are dependent on reflective thought and organized authority, they are not found, in the strict sense, below the human level. Their extreme importance in human society is indicated by the fact that they are forms of association which have been reflected upon, sanctioned, and established by human communities. They embody the chief consciously recognized values in the social life. Hence sociology is largely a study of institutions in their relations to the social life.

To begin our study of sociology it is evident that we should have, if possible, a more or less permanent, natural, group which is at the same time both a primary group and an institution. There is one such group in human society—the family. It is for this reason that the family is selected as the group with which to begin our study of the concrete problems of human society—because it illustrates in a simple way so many phases of social life. Many sociologists would begin with some other social group, such as the nation or the neighborhood; but the nation is not a primary group and is too large and complex to begin with.

However, much can be said for beginning the study of human relations with the study of the neighborhood or the local community.

The family group, in normal life, can exist only in a neighborhood or local community. As a social group the family is not entirely self-sufficing. Because of the aversion to incest, which is universally characteristic of mankind, there must be other families for intermarriage. Moreover, many social relations, such as those of kinship, for example, can arise only when there is a group of families living together. Nevertheless, human family life presents many of the traits of human society in miniature. Social interaction in the family can be easily observed. As a primary group, the family, in both its biological and its psychological constitution, illustrates the working of the main forces in human social groups. If we remember that the family as an institution is almost always found in the community, we shall find this primary group most fruitful for the understanding of all human relations. It is, moreover, the primary group with which the beginning student in sociology is probably most familiar. It is possible to begin sociological study with other primary groups, but sociology should begin with the study of primary groups, not only because they are familiar to the student, but because they help us to understand best the origin and development of human society. The study of the family, for example, furnishes clear illustrations of the forces involved in social origins, social development, and social organization. But let us now note the social functions of primary groups in general.

The Social Functions of Primary Groups.—(1) The intimate, face-to-face groups of men have always been (*the chief medium for the development of human social life*) for in them social life is most vividly realized. (They form the natural environment for the development of the social traits of the individual. Psychologically the stimulus of the presence of other individuals seems necessary for the development of those instincts, habits, feelings, ideas, and standards which make for social unity.) Hence the primary groups are (the chief means for socializing the individual.)

(2) The face-to-face association of primary groups, moreover, is (the chief means of preserving and passing along the *social tradition*—that is, *the knowledge, ideas, and values handed down from the past*—which is

the essential part of culture. While civilized society has devised specialized institutions for preserving and transmitting social tradition, such as schools, libraries, and museums, yet the continuity of the social life on its psychic side would be very imperfect if society had to depend on such specialized institutions. The primary groups are the chief bearers of culture or the social tradition, because they furnish the environment of the child from its earliest years. In them the child learns his language, and with his language he gets the fundamental knowledge, beliefs, and standards of his civilization. Moreover, the meaning of essential traditions is clearer to the young in these groups, because they are accompanied usually by the actual behavior correlated with the traditions. Hence, objectively, primary groups are also the main carriers of *custom*, in the sense of *sanctioned habits of behavior*. A certain tradition regarding government or morality, for example, when accompanied by observable actions, can be gotten by the child better than he can get it from the printed page or even the spoken word.

(3) The chief significance of primary groups in our social life, however, is that they are the source of primary social ideals. They furnish the "patterns" which we attempt to realize in our social life in general. Thus Professor Cooley says we get our notions of love, freedom, justice, and the like from such simple and widespread forms of society, since "in these relations mankind realizes itself, gratifies its primary needs, in a fairly satisfactory manner, and from the experience forms standards of what it is to expect from more elaborate association." He adds that the ideals of both democracy and Christianity have sprung naturally from the primary groups. The very ideal of social solidarity itself comes from the unity experienced in such groups.

Now, all progress in civilization is essentially a following out and development of "patterns." In the material realm, for example, we have been able to develop the steam engine and the flying machine by following out and improving certain patterns. So in social relations we get our primary patterns from the primary groups, and then strive to realize them in the wider social life. Hence the great significance of

these groups for understanding the whole development of human society and of civilization.

The Family as a Primary Group.—The family is the simplest group in human society capable of maintaining itself. It is in an especial sense, therefore, the primary social group. As its members, husband and wife, parents and children, have their places largely fixed in the group by their organic natures and relations, the family seems to be almost as much a biological structure as a social group. For this reason it presents especially clearly the biological forces operating in our social life. The family is not a product of other forms of association, but rather furnishes the possibilities of these. Containing as it does both sexes and all ages, it is not only capable of reproducing itself and society, but of illustrating and developing practically all essential human relationships. Thus the relations of superiority, subordination, and equality, which enter so largely into all social organization, are illustrated in the family in the relations of parents to children, of children to parents, of parents to each other, and of children to one another. Indeed, all essential relations of social interdependence are so fully illustrated in the family that it has often been justly called "society in miniature."

For this reason the work of the family in the social life has often been compared to that of the cell in the biological organism. Without pushing this analogy, however, it is evident that families do enter very largely as units into our social and industrial life, and we shall see that the character of our social life is very largely determined by the functioning of the family. The full evidence for this conclusion can be given only through the consideration of the origin, historical development, and present condition of the family; but a brief survey of the functions of the family in human society will suffice to show it to be the most important of human institutions. We shall consider these functions under three heads.

The Primary Function of the Family is continuing the life of the species; that is, the primary function of the family is reproduction in the sense of the birth and rearing of children. While other functions

of the family have been delegated in a large measure to other social institutions, it is manifest that this function cannot be so delegated. We know of no human society in which the birth and rearing of children has not been the essential function of the family. In present society, at least, the stream of life must flow through the family. The constitution of the family, therefore, determines the heredity of the child as well as its care and upbringing. If the family performed no other function than this of producing the new individuals of society and furnishing them physical care and nurture until maturity is reached, it would still be the most important of all human institutions. From a sociological point of view the childless family must be judged a failure. While the childless family may be of social utility to the individuals that form it, nevertheless from the point of view of society such a family has failed to perform its most important function and must be considered, therefore, to that extent socially a failure.

The Function of the Family in Conserving Social Possessions.—The family is still the chief institution in society for transmitting from one generation to another social possessions of all sorts, and, therefore, of conserving the social order. Property in the form of land or houses or personal property, society permits the family to pass along from generation to generation. Even the material equipment for industry, that is, capital, is so transmitted in present society. Thus under present conditions the child gets its material possessions, its economic equipment, for its start in life mainly from its family group.

While this transmission by the family of the material goods of society from one generation to another is obviously of the highest social importance, even more important is its function of transmitting the spiritual possessions of the race. The family is the chief bearer of social tradition, because the child gets its language mainly in the family; and in language is embodied all the beliefs, standards, and values of civilization regarding industry, government, law, religion, morality, the family, and general social life.

The Family as a School. So completely does the child get his essential social traditions from the family, that many educators hold that

the most essential things in social education can never be given in the public schools, but must be given in the home. This is especially true of religious and moral instruction. The real foundations of moral character are laid while the child is yet of preschool age in the family circle. In the family the child first learns the meaning of authority, obedience, loyalty, love, service, and all the human virtues. If the child fails to get proper moral standards and ideals from his family life, he gets them with greater difficulty, if at all, from society later. The same is true regarding political ideas and standards. If the child fails to learn in his family life loyalty to his country, respect for law, and the ideals of good citizenship, there are good prospects of his being numbered among the lawless or unpatriotic elements of society later. Even habits of work must be learned by the child largely in the family. Thus the rudiments of morality, of religion, of government, of law, and even of industry are transmitted in the family and learned by the child in his family group.

The family, in brief, furnishes the immediate environment of the child of tender age. Thus it is charged by society not only with producing its new individuals but with training them in the most essential relations and values of life. It is the group which has the greatest power to socialize the individual and to adjust him to the requirements even of a high civilization. If it fails to perform this important task, the chances are that unsocialized individuals will abound, and that social anarchy will sometime replace social order.

Thus the family is the great conserving agency in society to preserve social order and to transmit from generation to generation both the material and the spiritual possessions of the race.

The Function of the Family in Social Progress.—While the conservative functions of the family in social life are very obvious, the part which it plays in social progress has often been overlooked and even denied. Now social progress, we shall see later, depends mainly upon two things: the accumulation of knowledge and the accumulation of altruism—regard for others—in society. It is, of course, through the latter that the family life plays a part in social progress.

The family is the chief generator of altruism in society, and increasing altruism is necessary for the success of those more and more complex forms of co-operation which characterize higher civilization and upon which it depends. It is chiefly in the family that children learn to love, to be of service, to sacrifice for others, and to respect one another's rights. If the family fails to teach the spirit of service and self-sacrifice to its members, it is hardly probable that they will get much of that spirit from society at large. The amount of altruism in society, therefore, has a very close relation to the quality of its family life. Family affection is the natural root of altruism in society at large. As the family life is the chief teacher of altruism to the individual, and as society depends upon increasing altruism for each forward step in moral progress, so the family life plays a most important part in social progress.

There is another way also in which the altruism and solidarity of the family play a most important part in social evolution. All human history has, from one point of view, been a struggle to transfer the altruism and solidarity of the family to successively larger and larger groups of men. In other words, as we have already seen, the family is the primary group which has furnished the main moral "patterns" which society at large has set before itself as its goal. Our primary social ideals, in the main, come from the family. Thus the ideal of human brotherhood is manifestly derived from the family. So also are the ideals of love, service, self-sacrifice for the sake of service, and the like, in society at large. Higher civilization has set these ideals, which the family life has furnished, before it as the goals of progress.

Thus we have a brief presentation of the claim of the family to be regarded not only as the primary, but also as the most important institution of human society. While primarily its function is the birth and proper rearing of children, yet in performing this function it has become the chief medium for carrying and nourishing the essential values of civilization. It has been the cradle of civilization in the past, and something like its organization at best seems to be the normal goal which men set up for society at large to realize. The nation whose

family life decays, therefore, rots at the core; for its chief spring of social and civic virtue dries up.

The Family and Modern Industry.—The family is so dependent upon industrial conditions in performing its functions, and industrial conditions so react upon the family life, that a word must be said about the interactions of these two before we undertake to trace the origin and development of the family as a human institution.

The Domestic Arts. Primitively all industry centered in the family. Modern industry is but an enormous expansion of primitive housekeeping; that is, the preparation of food and clothing and shelter by the primitive family group for its own existence is the germ out of which all modern industry has developed. The very word *economics* means the science or the art of the household.

In primitive communities and in new settled districts the family often carried on all essential industrial activities. It produced all the raw material, manufactured the finished products, and consumed the same. This development of household arts greatly aided the development of human culture and at the same time integrated the family, as it made the family a more or less self-sufficing economic unit. The family was in this stage of social and industrial development a more complete miniature society or community, and the tradition grew up that these domestic arts must be maintained in the home if the family was to retain its integrity.

But with the growth of a complex civilization there has come a great industrial division of labor, and the family has delegated industrial activity after activity to some other institution until at the present time the modern family performs scarcely any industrial activities, except the preparation of food for immediate consumption. Even this in modern cities seems about to be delegated to some other institution.

All that need be said at present about the delegation of the industrial activities of the family to other industrial institutions is that the movement is not one which need cause any anxiety so long as it does not interfere with the essential function of the family, namely, the

birth and proper rearing of children. Even though children can no longer learn the domestic arts and the rudiments of industry in their home life, still it is possible through manual, industrial, and domestic science training in our public schools to teach these to all children. And the removal of arts and industries from the home, even such essential industries as the preparation of food, is not to be regarded as necessarily evil. It may be a boon if it gives more time to the parents, especially to the mother, for the proper care and bringing up of the children.

The Wages of Men. This removal of industries from the home, however, while theoretically to be welcomed, has in practice under present economic conditions not always had the beneficent effect of giving more time to parents for the proper care of their children and of securing a better home life. On the contrary, the removal of industries from the home has often been followed by the removal of both parents and children, the rendering of the family's economic situation precarious, and the practical disintegration of home life. The wages of the male worker outside of the home have too often tended to conform to the single man's standard, though government statistics show that the earnings of the husband constitute 80 per cent of the total income of the average wage-earner's family in the United States. Thus the Federal Census Bureau states that in 1939 the median income from wages of male wage earners in the United States that year was $967, though earlier research had established the fact that the least income on which a family consisting of two parents and three young children could maintain a decent standard of living was, for large cities, $1700 to $1900 a year, and for smaller cities from $1200 to $1500 a year. The National Resources Committee showed that for one year (in 1935–36) the average income for wage-earning families in the United States was $1289, but that from $1100 to $1400, according to locality, was necessary in our cities to maintain a decent standard of living for a family of five. Evidently modern industry has been quite regardless of the family, and has in many instances made it very difficult to maintain a proper home life.

The Labor of Women. This has been all the more the case because in many instances married women, often mothers, have gone into factories to supplement the insufficient income of the family. Under such circumstances the home has often become a mere lodging place, children have been neglected and allowed to grow up on the streets and hence as unsocialized individuals. In 1940 women wage earners formed 24.3 per cent of the total breadwinners in the United States. Of the over eleven million women wage earners, 2,322,252 were employed in manufacturing industries. About 37 per cent of all the women at work for wages in 1940 were married, and the number of married women so employed had quadrupled since 1900. In foreign countries the proportion is much larger. It is too late to stop this movement, but the labor of married women should be strictly regulated by the state. They should be excluded from certain industries, their hours of labor, wages, and conditions of work should be prescribed, and above all, their employment for a given period before and after the birth of children should be prohibited; for it has been found that wherever mothers of very young children are employed outside of the home, there is an abnormally high rate of infant mortality.

Even the labor of young unmarried women in factories has many dangers to the family; for they are by such work but poorly prepared for the duties of wifehood and motherhood and in some cases their health may be impaired. These evils can be met, however, by greater attention to education in the domestic arts in our schools and by stricter regulation of the conditions of the labor of women by the state in all respects.

The Labor of Children. Perhaps the climax of the encroachment of modern industry upon the home comes when it takes young children out of the home and puts them to work. As late as 1930 three quarters of a million children under fifteen years of age were employed in the United States outside of their families, though only about one fourth of these were in factories, shops, stores, and mines. The labor of children outside of the home sprang very largely from the insuffi-

ciency of family income noted above. While child labor is often defended as having the merit of giving the child some industrial training, yet careful and extensive investigations show that its net result is to dwarf the child in body and mind, to lower the wages of adults, and above all, to deprive the child of that education which alone can prepare him for efficient citizenship. The drafting of children who have not yet completed their work in the grades into industry must be regarded, therefore, as altogether an evil. Hence a Federal law passed in 1938 forbids the labor of children in industries engaged in interstate trade.

The remedy for these evils is not to put industrial work back in the home. That, under modern conditions, produces what is called "the sweat shop," which is perhaps a worse evil than any above described. The remedy is rather in so organizing industry that it will not needlessly encroach upon our family life—in securing adequate wages, reasonable hours, wholesome conditions of work in industry. This means that our industry must be organized about our family life rather than our family life about industry.

The Subordination of Industry to Family Life is necessary, therefore, from a social point of view. Industry, as we have seen, was primitively an adjunct of family life, and all modern industry, if rightfully developed, should be but an adjunct to family life. Industrial considerations must be, therefore, subordinate to domestic considerations, that is, to considerations of the welfare of parents and their children in the family group. One trouble with modern society is that industry has come to dominate as an independent interest that oftentimes does not recognize its reasonable and socially necessary subordination to the higher interests of society. There can be no sane and stable family life until we are willing to subordinate the requirements of industry to the requirements of the family for the good birth and proper rearing of children. This means that the securing of a normal family life for all classes, rather than mere economic prosperity, should be the first consideration in all attempts at social reconstruction. But the full significance of a normal family life

for human welfare and how it can be secured will be evident only when we have considered the origin, history, and present condition of the family.

Summary.—Primary, or face-to-face, groups are the key to the understanding of our social life; for in them social life is at its maximum. They perform three chief functions: (1) they socialize the individual; (2) they are the chief carriers of custom and tradition; (3) they are the source of primary social ideals or "social patterns." The family is the chief primary group and the most important of human institutions, since it controls largely the birth and the rearing of children. Because the family involves such a close association of both sexes and all ages and enlists so many of the forces that make or mar social life, it illustrates the problem of human relations—the "social problem"—in the clearest possible manner. Therefore, the understanding of the origin and historical development of the family is necessary for the understanding of present human society in general. The good and evil of the family life are sure to reflect themselves throughout society. If what has been said regarding the importance of the family as an institution is true, then it is evident that the securing of a normal family life for all classes must be the central aim of scientific social reconstruction. All that is involved in a "normal family life" will become evident, however, only as we proceed to the survey of all of our social problems.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Psychology of Human Society*, Chap. IV.
COOLEY, C. H., *Social Organization*, Chaps. III-V.
COOLEY, C. H., ANGELL, R. B., and CARR, L. J., *Introductory Sociology*, Chap. IV.

For more extended reading:

ADLER, F., *Marriage and Divorce*, Chap. I.
ANDREWS, B. R., *Economics of the Household*, 2nd Ed., Chap. II.

BALLARD, L. V., *Social Institutions*, Chap. III.
BOGARDUS, E. S., *Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. V-VIII.
BUSHEE, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chap. XVIII.
DAWSON, C. A., and GETTYS, W. C., *Introduction to Sociology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. I-III.
ELIOT, T. D., *American Standards and Planes of Living*, Chaps. I-III.
FINDLAY, J. J., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chap. VI.
GILLETTE, J. M., and REINHARDT, J. M., *Problems of a Changing Social Order*, Chap. 23.
GROVES, E. R., *The Family and Its Social Functions*, Chaps. I-III.
LYND, R. S., *Middletown*, Chaps. VIII-XII.
MACIVER, R. M., *Society, A Textbook of Sociology*, Chaps. XI-XII.
ROSENQUIST, C. M., *Social Problems*, Chaps. 17-18.
SMITH, W. R., *Introduction to Educational Sociology*, Chap. IV.
SNEDDEN, D., *Educational Sociology*, Chap. V.
SPENCER, A. G., *The Family and Its Members*, Chap. XIII.
YOUNG, K., *Source Book for Sociology*, Chap. I.
YOUNG, K., *Sociology, A Study of Society and Culture*, Chap. 3.
ZIMMERMAN, C. C., *The Changing Community.*

Brief bibliography on social surveys and family monographs (see Preface of this book, page iv):

ARONOVICI, C., *The Social Survey.*
DAWSON, C. A., and GETTYS, W. E., *Introduction to Sociology*, Study Manual, pp. 831-845.
ELMER, M. C., *Technique of Social Surveys*, Rev. Ed.
LYND, R. S., *Middletown*, Chaps. I-II.
PALMER, V., *Field Studies in Sociology.*
TAYLOR, C. C., *The Social Survey* (in *University of Missouri Bulletins*).
Bibliography of Social Surveys, published by Sage Foundation, New York, N. Y.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What are "forms of association"? Classify them. What are "communities"? Why are they important sociologically?

2. What is an institution? Is the unity of an institution physical or psychical? Is this true, also, of all human social groups? Illustrate from the family.

3. What are "primary groups"? Why are they so important in social life? What functions do they perform? What are "social attitudes"?

4. Why do we regard the family as a "primary" group? Why is it socially important? What are its functions?

5. How do our primary social patterns and attitudes originate?

6. What is socialization? How does it take place? What does it do?

7. Describe the perfectly socialized individual.

8. How is culture transmitted?

9. Describe the contribution of the family to our social ideals. The contribution of the neighborhood. The contribution of the play group.

10. What are "secondary groups"? Mention some typical examples.

11. Describe the influence upon the behavior of modern men of the state, the economic class, the religious sect, and the great city.

12. Why do secondary groups create problems? How can they be solved?

13. Why is the form of association, or of group organization so important? What is its effect upon the individual? upon the group?

14. Classify social groups according to the method of social control.

15. How has modern industry affected the modern family?

16. What does this show about the effects of secondary groups upon primary groups?

17. Explain why the understanding of primary groups is necessary for the understanding of human society.

For classroom discussion:

1. Is the nation the primary group which we should consider in a scientific study of human relations?

2. What is the essential mark of a primary group?

3. How do primary groups set the pattern for human social development? for democracy? for Christianity?

4. What is the difference between primary groups and "we-groups"? between secondary groups and "others-groups"?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Are primary group ideals applicable to human relations at large?

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY

We must understand the biological roots of the family before we can understand the family as an institution, and especially before we can understand its origin. Let us note, then, briefly the chief biological facts connected with family life.

The Biological Foundations of the Family.—(1) *The Family rests upon the Great Biological Fact of Sex.* While sex does not characterize all animal forms, still it does characterize all except the simplest forms of animal life. These simplest forms multiply or reproduce by fission, but such asexual reproduction is almost entirely confined to the unicellular forms of life. It may be inferred, therefore, that the higher animal types could not have been evolved without sexual reproduction, and something of the meaning or significance of sex in the whole life-process will, therefore, be helpful in understanding all of the higher forms of evolution. Biologists tell us that the meaning or purpose of sexual reproduction is to bring about greater organic variation. Now variation, as we have seen, is the raw material upon which natural selection acts to create the higher types. The immense superiority of sexual reproduction over asexual reproduction is due to the fact that it multiplies so greatly the elements of heredity in each new organism, for under sexual reproduction every new organism has two parents, four grandparents, and so on, each of which perhaps contributes something to its heredity. The biological meaning of sex, then, is that it is a device of nature to bring about organic variation. From the point of view of the social life we may note also that sex adds greatly to its variety, enriching it with numerous fruitful variations which undoubtedly further social evolution. The bareness and monotony of a social life without sex can readily be imagined.

While the differences between the sexes have been mainly elaborated through the differences of reproductive function, yet these differences have come to be fundamental to the whole nature of the organism. In the higher animals, therefore, the sexes differ profoundly in many ways from each other. Biologists tell us that the chief difference between the male and the female organism is a difference in metabolism, that is, in the rapidity of chemical change which goes on within the body. In the male metabolism is much more rapid than in the female; hence the male organism is said to be more catabolic. In the female the rapidity of chemical change is less; hence the female is said to be more anabolic. Put in more familiar terms, the male tends to expend energy, is more active, hence also stronger; the female tends more to store up energy, is more passive, conservative, and weaker. These fundamental differences between the sexes express themselves in many ways in the social life. The differences between man and woman, therefore, are not to be thought of as due simply to social customs and usages, the different social environment of the two sexes, but are even more due to a radical and fundamental difference in their whole nature. The belief that the two sexes would become like each other in character if given the same environment is, therefore, erroneous. That sex differences are often inborn, and not acquired, may be readily seen by observing children of different sex. Even from their earliest years boys are more active, restless, energetic, destructive, untidy, and disobedient, while little girls are quieter, less restless, less destructive, neater, more orderly, and more obedient. These different innate qualities fit the sexes naturally for different functions in human society, and there is, therefore, a natural division of labor between them, which indeed may be said to be the fundamental division of labor in human society.

The causes which produce sex in the individual are probably beyond the control of man. Sex seems to be a form of Mendelian inheritance,[1] and is determined by the nature of the germ cells which unite to form the new individual. While the number of the two sexes at maturity

[1]See Castle's *Heredity*, Chapter X.

varies in different species according to obscure factors, in practically all of the higher species, man included, they are relatively equal. In human society much depends upon this relative numerical equality of the two sexes. Hence it is fortunate that man does not know how to control the sex of offspring, for if he did the numerical equality of the two sexes might be disturbed and serious social results would follow.

(2) *The Influence of Parental Care.* Sex alone could never have produced the family in the sense of a relatively permanent group of parents and offspring. We do not begin to find the family until we get to those higher types where we find some parental care. In the lowest types the relation between the sexes is momentary and the survival of offspring is secured simply through the production of enormous numbers. Thus the sturgeon, a low type of fish, produces between one and two million eggs at a single spawning, from which it is estimated that not more than a dozen individuals survive till maturity is reached. Thus sexual reproduction of itself necessitates no parental care and in itself could give rise in no way to the family; but quite low in the scale of life we begin to find some parental care as a device to protect immature offspring and secure their survival without the expenditure of such an enormous amount of energy in mere physiological reproduction. Even among the fishes we find some that watch over the eggs after they are spawned, and care for their young by leading them to suitable feeding grounds. In such cases a much smaller number of young need to be produced in order that a few may survive until maturity is reached. In the mammals the mother, obviously, must care for the young for some time, since mammals are animals that suckle their young. But this care of the young by a single parent only foreshadows the family as we understand it. Among the mammals it is not until we reach the higher types that we find care of offspring by both parents,—a practice, however, which is common among the birds. It is evident that as soon as both parents are concerned in the care of the offspring they have a much better chance of survival. Hence, natural selection favors the growth of this type of group life and develops powerful instincts to keep male and female

together till after the birth and rearing of offspring. Such we find to be the condition among many of the higher mammals, such as some of the carnivora, and especially among the monkeys and apes and man.

If it is allowable at this point to generalize from the facts given, it must be said that family life is essentially a device of nature for the preservation of offspring through a more or less prolonged infancy. The family group and the instincts upon which it rests were undoubtedly, therefore, instituted by natural selection. Summing up, then, the animal family group owes its existence, first, to the production of child or immature forms that need more or less prolonged care; secondly, to the prolongation of this period of immaturity in the higher animals, and especially in man; thirdly, to the development, parallel with these two causes, of parental instincts which keep male and female together for the care of the offspring. It is evident, then, that the family life rests, not upon sex attraction, but upon the fact of the child and the corresponding psychological fact of parental instinct. The family, then, has been created by the very conditions of life itself and is not a man-made institution.

The Origin of the Family in the Human Species. — Two great theories of the origin of the family in the human species have in the past been more or less accepted, and these we must now examine and criticize: first, the traditional theory that the human family life was from the beginning a pure monogamy; secondly, the so-called evolutionary theory that the human family life arose from confused if not promiscuous sex relations. The first of these theories, favored both by the Bible and by Aristotle, held undisputed sway down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Then, after the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859, certain social theorists began to put forward the second theory in the name of evolution. In order that we may see precisely what the origin of the human family life was, and its primitive form, we must now proceed to criticize these two theories, especially the last, which is known as the hypothesis of a primitive state of promiscuity.

The Habits of the Higher Animals. We have already considered the origin of the family group in the animal world generally, but it must be admitted that there are some difficulties in arguing directly from the lower animals to man. Man is so separated from the lower animals by having passed through many higher stages of an independent evolution that in many respects his life is peculiar to itself. This is true especially of his family life. If we survey the whole range of animal life and then the whole range of human life, we find that there are but two or three striking similarities between the family life of man and that of the brutes, but a great many striking dissimilarities. The similarities may be summed up by saying that man exhibits in common with all the animals the phenomena of courtship, that is, of the male seeking to win the female, also the phenomenon of male jealousy, and we may perhaps add an instinctive aversion to crossing with other species. These characteristics of his family life man shares with the brutes below him. There are, however, many things peculiar to the human family life that are found in no animal species below man. The most striking of these differences may be mentioned. (1) Man has no pairing season, as practically all other animals have. (2) The number of young born in the human species is on the whole much smaller than in any other animal species. (3) The dependence of offspring upon parents is far longer in the human species than in any other species. (4) Man has an antipathy to incest or close inbreeding which seems to be instinctive. This is not found clearly in any animal species below man. (5) There is a tendency among human beings to artificial adornment during the period of courtship, but not to natural ornament to any extent, as among many animal species. (6) The indorsement of society is almost invariably sought, both among uncivilized and civilized peoples, before the establishment of a new family—usually through the forms of a religious marriage ceremony. (7) Chastity in married women is universally insisted upon, as the basis of human family life; and among higher civilized peoples there is equal insistence upon the chastity of women before marriage. (8) There is a feeling of modesty

or of shame as regards matters of sex among the human beings. (9) In humanity we find, besides animal lust, spiritual affection, or love, as a bond of union between the two sexes.

None of these peculiarities of human family life are found in the family life of any animal species below man. It might seem, therefore, that man's family life must be regarded as a special creation unconnected with the family life of the brutes below him. But this view is hardly probable; rather it is impossible from the standpoint of evolution. We must say that these peculiarities of human family life are to be explained through the fact that man has passed through many more stages of evolution, particularly of intellectual evolution, than any of the animals below him. If we examine these peculiarities of man's family life carefully, we find that they all can be explained through natural selection and the cultural evolution of man. That man has no pairing season, has fewer offspring born, and a longer period of dependence of the offspring upon parents, and the like, is directly to be explained through natural selection; while seeking the indorsement of society before forming a new family, sexual modesty, tendencies to artificial adornment, and the like, are to be explained through man's self-consciousness and higher intellectual development, also through the fuller development of his social life. The gap between the human family life and brute family life is, therefore, not an unbridgeable one.

That this is so, we see most clearly when we consider the family life of the higher apes—man's nearest cousins in the animal world. All of these apes, of which the chief representatives are the gorilla, orangutan, and the chimpanzee, live in relatively permanent family groups, usually monogamous. These family groups are almost human in many of their characteristics, such as the care which the male parent gives to the mother and her offspring, and the seeming affection which exists between all members of the group. Such a group of parents and offspring among the higher apes is, moreover, a relatively permanent affair, children of different ages being frequently found along with their parents in such groups. So far as the evidence of

animals next to man, therefore, goes, there is no reason for supposing that the human family life sprang from confused or promiscuous sex relations in which no permanent union between male and female parent existed. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe, with Westermarck, that human family life is an inheritance from man's prehuman progenitor.

The Evidence from the Lower Human Races.—The evidence afforded by the lowest peoples in point of culture even more clearly, if anything, refutes the hypothesis of a primitive state of promiscuity. The habits or customs of the lowest peoples were not well known previous to the nineteenth century. Therefore it was possible for such a theory as the patriarchal theory of the primitive family to remain generally accepted, even by most scientists, down to the middle of the nineteenth century. This was the theory that the oldest or most primitive type of human family life is that depicted in the opening pages of the Book of Genesis, namely, a family life in which the father or eldest male of the family group is the absolute ruler of the group and practically owner of all persons and property. The belief that this was the primitive type of the human family life was first attacked by a German-Swiss philologist by the name of Bachofen in a work entitled *Das Mutterrecht* (The Matriarchate), published in 1861, in which he argued that antecedent to the patriarchal period was a matriarchal period, in which women were dominant socially and politically, and in which relationships were traced through mothers only. Bachofen got his evidence for this theory from certain ancient legends, such as that of the Amazons, and other remains in Greek and Roman literature, which seemed to point to a period antecedent to the patriarchal.

In 1877 Mr. Lewis H. Morgan, an American ethnologist and sociologist, put forth again, independently, practically the same theory, basing it upon an extensive study of the North American Indian tribes. Morgan had lived among the Iroquois Indians for years and had mastered their system of relationship, which previously had puzzled the whites. He found that they traced relationship

through mothers only, and not at all along the male line. This method of reckoning relationship, moreover, he found also characterized practically all of the North American Indian tribes, and he argued that the only explanation of it was that originally sexual relations were of such an unstable or promiscuous character that they would not permit of tracing descent through fathers.

From these theories sociological writers put forth the conclusion that the primitive state was one of promiscuity, with monogamy emerging only after intermediate stages of limited promiscuity, polyandry, and polygamy. A somewhat similar theory has lately been set forth by Robert Briffault in his monumental study of *The Mothers.*

Before giving a criticism in detail of this theory let us note whether the evidence from the lowest peoples confirms it. The lowest peoples in point of culture are not the North American Indians nor the African Negroes, but certain isolated groups that live almost in a state of nature, without any attempt to cultivate the soil or to control nature in other respects. Such are the Bushmen of South Africa, the Australian aborigines, the Negritos of the Philippine Islands and of the Andaman Islands, the Veddas of Ceylon, and the Fuegians of South America. Now all these peoples, with a possible exception,[1] practice monogamy and live in relatively stable family groups. Their monogamy, however, is not of the type found in patriarchal times or among civilized peoples, but is a simple pairing monogamy, husband and wife remaining together indefinitely if children are born, but separating easily if childless. Edward Westermarck in his *History of Human Marriage* showed that nothing approaching promiscuity existed among these lower peoples. Promiscuity is apt to be found at a higher stage of social development, and is especially apt to be found among the nature peoples after the white man has visited them and demoralized their family life. But in all these cases the

[1]The Australian aborigines. For the evidence of promiscuity among them, see Spencer and Gillen's *Native Tribes of Central Australia.* But consult also B. Malinowski's *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines.*

existence of promiscuity is manifestly something exceptional and abnormal. Perhaps civilized peoples such as the Romans of the decadence have more nearly approximated the condition of promiscuity than any savage people of which we have knowledge. At any rate, the lowest existing savages found in the nineteenth century had definite forms of family life, and the type usually found was the simple pairing monogamy mentioned above.

Objections to the Hypothesis of a Primitive State of Promiscuity.—Let us now briefly sum up the main criticisms of this theory of a primitive state of promiscuity, not only as they may be derived from inductive study of the higher animals and the lower peoples, but also as they may be deduced from known psychological and biological facts or principles.

(1) In the first place, then, the animals that are most nearly similar to man, namely, the higher apes, do not show a condition of promiscuity.

(2) The evidence from the lower peoples does not show that such a condition exists or has ever existed among them.

(3) A third argument against this hypothesis may be gained from what we know of primitive economic conditions. Under the most primitive conditions in which man had no mastery over nature, food supply was relatively scarce, and as a rule only very small groups of people could live together. The smallness of primitive groups, on account of the scarcity of food supply, would prevent anything like promiscuity on a large scale.

(4) A fourth argument of a deductive nature is that the jealousy of the male, which characterizes all higher animals and especially man, would prevent anything like the existence of sexual promiscuity. The tendency of man would have been to appropriate one or more women for himself and drive away all rivals. Long ago Darwin argued that this would prevent anything like the existence of a general state of promiscuity.

(5) A fifth argument against this theory may be got from the general biological fact that sexual promiscuity tends to pathological

conditions unfavorable to fecundity, that is, fertility, or the birth of offspring. Physicians have long ago ascertained this fact, and the modern prostitute gives illustration of it by the fact that she has few or no children. Among the lower animal species, in which some degree of promiscuity obtains, moreover, powerful instincts keep the sexes apart except at the pairing season. Now, no such instincts exist in man. Promiscuity in man would, therefore, greatly lessen the birth rate, and any group that practiced it to any extent would soon be eliminated in competition with other groups that did not practice it.

(6) We have finally the general social fact that promiscuity would lead to the neglect of children. Promiscuity means that the male parent does not remain with the female parent to care for the offspring and, therefore, in the human species it would mean that the care of children would be thrown wholly upon the mother. This means that the children would have less chance of surviving. Not only would promiscuity lead to lessening the birth rate, but it would lead to a much higher mortality in children born. This is found to be a striking fact wherever we find any degree of promiscuity among any people. Hence, promiscuity would soon exterminate any people that practiced it extensively in competition with other peoples that did not practice it.

From all of these lines of argument, without going over the evidence in greater detail, it seems reasonable to conclude with Westermarck "that the hypothesis of a primitive state of promiscuity has no foundation in fact and is essentially unscientific." The facts put forth in support of the theory do not justify the conclusion, Westermarck says, that promiscuity has ever been a general practice among a single people and much less that it was the primitive state. Promiscuity is found, however, more or less in the form of sexual irregularities or immorality among all peoples; more often, however, among the civilized than among the uncivilized, but among no people has it ever existed unqualified by more enduring forms of sex relation. Moreover, because promiscuity breaks up the social bonds, throws

the burden of the care of children wholly upon the mother, and lessens the birth rate, we are justified in concluding that promiscuity is essentially an antisocial practice. This agrees with the facts generally shown by criminology and sociology, that the elements practicing promiscuity to any great extent in modern societies are those most closely related with the degenerate and criminal elements. Those elements, in other words, in modern society that practice promiscuity are on the road to extinction, and if a people generally were to practice it there is no reason to believe that such a people would meet with any different fate.

The Earliest Form of Family Life in the Human Species, therefore, is probably that of the simple pairing monogamous family found among many of the higher animals, especially the anthropoid apes, and also found among the lower peoples. This primitive monogamy, however, as we have already seen, was not accompanied by the social, legal, and religious elements that the historic monogamic family has largely rested upon. On the contrary, this primitive monogamy rested solely upon an instinctive basis, and, as we have seen, unless children were born it was apt to be relatively unstable. Permanency in family relations among primitive peoples depended largely upon the birth of children. Thus we find confirmed our conclusion drawn some pages back that family life rests primarily upon instinctive tendencies connected with child care. That it still so rests is shown by the fact, as we shall see later, that divorce is many times more common among couples that have no children than among those that have children.

Some General Sociological Conclusions have now become evident. The first is that the values of human society are in part biologically created. The biological processes of life have created the family group, and the family as an institution rests upon these biological processes. The second is that the fundamental institutions of human society, as they necessarily rest upon biological conditions, generally have corresponding to them certain fundamental instinctive tendencies. Not all human social organization is man-made. Therefore,

to attempt to reorganize human society regardless of the biological conditions of life, or regardless of fundamental human "instincts," is to meet with certain failure.

While human institutions cannot be arbitrary, this is not saying that human institutions cannot be modified by human intelligence. All culture is a result of man's attempts to modify and control natural conditions and natural tendencies. But if the modification is to result in permanent human advantage, the conditions of life generally, and the fundamental emotions and instinctive drives of human nature, must be respected. The social order cannot be made a matter of individual taste or of arbitrary caprice.

We have seen that the family from primitive times has been the central institution of human society. It has been a device, partly instinctive, partly intelligent, to control the reproductive process, that is, the birth and rearing of children. With this end it has attempted to regulate the relations of the sexes. Such control over the reproductive process has been one of the main aims of all social organization in the past, whether of savage peoples or of civilized peoples; and upon this control over the birth and rearing of children practically the whole structure of moral civilization has been based.

Two practical conclusions stand out in regard to the family. First, the control over the reproductive process which the family attempts evidently precludes the social toleration of promiscuity, or even of free love. Promiscuity, or even great instability in the family life, would seriously impair social control over the birth and rearing of children, and so would undermine the foundations of higher civilization. The second practical conclusion is, seeing that neither the state nor industry had to do with the origin of the family, but rather the biological requirements for human survival, neither the state nor industry may safely determine the form of the family. On the contrary, their interests, as we have already said, should be subordinated to the securing of a normal family life, for the good birth and proper rearing of children in all classes.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *Cultural Evolution*, Chap. XIV.
HART, H. N. and ELLA B., *Personality and the Family*, Rev. Ed., Chap. I.
TOZZER, A. M., *Social Origins and Social Continuities*, Chap. IV.

For more extended reading:

BALLARD, S. V., *Social Institutions*, Chap. II.
BRIFFAULT, R., *The Mothers*, Vol. I, pp. 200-327.
FRAZER, J. G., *Totemism and Exogamy*, Vol. IV.
GEDDES and THOMSON, *Sex*, Chaps. V, VII-IX.
GILLIN, J. L., DITTMER, C. G., and COLBERT, R. J., *Social Problems*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. 11-13.
GOODSELL, W., *A History of Marriage and the Family*, Rev. Ed., Chap. I.
GOODSELL, W., *Problems of the Family*, Chap. I.
GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family*, Chap. I.
LOWIE, R. H., *Primitive Society*, Chaps. I-II.
MALINOWSKI, B., *The Family Among Australian Aborigines.*
MARGOLD, C. W., *Sex Freedom and Social Control*, Chap. III.
MORGAN, L. H., *Ancient Society*, Part II, Chap. III.
PARSONS, E., *The Family*, Lectures, I, II, VI.
REUTER, E. B., and RUNNER, J. R., *The Family.*
SPENCER, A. G., *The Family and Its Members*, Chap. III.
SPENCER, H., *Principles of Sociology*, Vol. I, Part III.
STARCKE, C. N., *The Primitive Family.*
THOMAS, W. I., *Source Book for Social Origins*, Part IV.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What are the two biological facts which constitute the foundation of the family?
2. Discuss the significance of each of these in social life.
3. Give a definition of the family.
4. To what general biological facts does the animal family group owe its existence?

5. What two chief theories are there as to the origin of the family in the human species? Can we accept either as scientific?

6. What are the similarities and what are the differences between the family life of brutes and of men?

7. How would you explain the differences?

8. Is this what explains the differences between animals and human social life in general?

9. Mention some of the lowest peoples in point of culture. What, in general, is the type of their family life?

10. What do you think of the hypothesis of a primitive state of promiscuity?

11. What was probably the earliest form of family life in the human species?

12. In what ways does the origin of the family illustrate the origin of human society?

For classroom discussion:

1. Is sex or the care of offspring the biological basis of the family?

2. Is parental care primarily instinctive or intelligent?

3. What pre-cultural (*i.e.*, purely natural) elements are found in human sex relations and family life?

4. Are fundamental institutions wholly man-made?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Are human institutions "arbitrary inventions" (*i.e.*, mere conventions or contractual agreements)?

CHAPTER VI

THE FORMS OF THE FAMILY

The family as an institution has varied greatly in its forms from age to age and from people to people. This is what we should expect, seeing that all organic structures are variable. Such variations in human institutions are due partly to the influences of the environment, partly to the state of knowledge, and partly to many other causes as yet not well understood. The family illustrates in greater or less degree the working of these causes of variation and of change in human institutions.

As regards the general form of the family we have to note first of all the two great forms which we may characterize respectively as "the maternal family" and "the paternal family."

The Maternal or Metronymic Family.—As we have already seen, Bachofen, Morgan, and others discovered a condition of human society in which relationship was traced through mothers only, and in which property or authority descended along the female line rather than along the male line. Further investigation and research have shown that up to recent times, say up to the early part of the nineteenth century, one half of all the peoples of the world, if we reckon them by nations and tribes rather than by numbers, practiced this system of reckoning kinship through mothers only, and passed property and authority down along the female line. Ethnologists and sociologists have practically concluded, from the amount of evidence now collected, that this maternal or metronymic system was the primitive system of tracing relationships, and that it was succeeded among the European peoples by the paternal system so long ago that the transition from the one to the other has been forgotten, except as some trace of it has been preserved in customs, legends, and the like.

Among many tribes of the North American Indians this metronymic or maternal system was peculiarly well-developed. Children took their mother's name, not their father's name; belonged to their mother's clan, not their father's clan; and the chief transmitted his authority, if hereditary, not to his own son, but to his eldest sister's son. The relatives on the father's side, indeed, were quite ignored. Frequently the maternal uncle had more legal authority over the children than their own father, seeing that the children belonged to his clan, that is, to their mother's clan.

Now, Bachofen claimed not only that in this stage kinship was reckoned through mothers only, but that women were dominant socially and politically; that there existed a true matriarchy, or rule of the mothers. Do the facts support Bachofen's theory? Let us see. The Wyandot Indians, a branch of the Iroquois, were a typical maternal or metronymic people. Among them, without any doubt, the women had a position of influence socially and even politically which often is not found among peoples of higher culture. For example, among the Wyandots the government of the clan was in the hands of four women councilors (Matrons), who were elected by all the adults in the clan. These four women councilors, however, elected a Peace Sachem, who carried out the will of the clan in all matters pertaining to peace generally. Moreover, the councilors of the several clans, four fifths of whom were women, met together to form the Tribal Council; but in this Tribal Council the women sat separate, not participating in the deliberations, but exercising only a veto power on the decisions of the men. In matters of war, however, government was intrusted to two war chiefs elected from the tribe generally, the women here only having the right to veto the decision of the tribe to enter upon the warpath. Thus we see that while the women of the Iroquois Indians had a great deal of social and political influence, the actual work of government was largely turned over by them to the men, and especially was this true of directing the affairs of the tribe in time of war. There is no doubt, however, that in the maternal stage of social evolution women had an influence in

domestic, religious, and social matters much greater than they had at many later stages of social development. Among the Zuñi of New Mexico, for example, another well-developed maternal people, marriage is always arranged by the bride's parents. The husband goes to live with his wife, and is practically a guest in his wife's house all his life long, she alone having the right of divorce. Indeed, among maternal peoples the rule is that the husband goes to live with the wife, and not the wife with the husband, the children, as we have already seen, keeping the mother's name and belonging to her kindred or clan.

Nevertheless there is no historic evidence to support Bachofen's theory of the primitive maternal system being a true matriarchy, or government by women. On the contrary, among all of these maternal peoples, while the women may have much influence socially and politically, the men, on account of their superior strength, are intrusted with the work not only of protecting and providing for the families and driving away enemies, but also largely with the work of maintaining the internal government and order of the people. Strictly speaking, therefore, there has never been a matriarchal stage of social evolution, but rather a maternal or metronymic stage.

As we have already seen, this stage was probably the primitive one. How are we to explain, then, that primitive man reckoned kinship through mothers only? Was this due, as Morgan thought, to a primitive practice of promiscuity which prevented tracing relationships through fathers? The reply is, that among the many maternal peoples now well known, among whom relationships are traced through mothers only, we find no evidence of the practice of general promiscuity now or even in remote times. The North American Indians, for example, had quite definite forms of family life and were very far removed from the practice of promiscuity, though they traced relationship through mothers only. It is evident that the causes of the maternal family and the maternal system of relationship are not so simple as Morgan supposed. What, then, were the causes

of the maternal system? It is certain that man in the earliest times did not know the physiological connection between father and child. The physiological connection between mother and child, on the other hand, was an obvious fact which required no knowledge of physiology to establish; therefore, nothing was more natural than for primitive man to recognize that the child was of the mother's blood, but not of the father's blood. Therefore, the child belonged to the mother's people and not to the father's people. If it be asked whether it is possible that there could be any human beings so ignorant that they do not know the physiological connection between father and child, the reply is, that this is apparently the case among a number of very primitive peoples, even down to recent times. It is not infrequent among these peoples to find conception and childbirth attributed to the influence of the spirits, rather than to relations between male and female. While, therefore, a social connection between the father and the children was recognized, leading the father to provide in all ways for his children, as fathers do whether among civilized or among uncivilized peoples, yet the blood relationship between the father and the child could not have been clear in the most primitive times.

Perhaps an even more efficient cause, however, of the maternal system was the fact that the mother in primitive times was the stable element in the family life, the constant center of the family. The husband was frequently away from home, hunting or fighting, and oftentimes failed to return. Nothing was more natural, therefore, than that the child should be reckoned as belonging to the mother, take her name, and belong to her kindred or clan. Moreover, after the custom of naming children from mothers and reckoning them as belonging to the mother's clan was established, it could not be displaced by the mere discovery of the physiological connection between the father and the child. On the contrary, social habits, like habits in the individual, tend to persist until they work badly. We find, therefore, the maternal system persisting among peoples who for many generations had come fully to recognize the physiological

connection of father and child. Indeed, the maternal system could never have been done away with if social evolution had not brought about new and complex conditions which caused the system to break down and to be replaced by the paternal system.

The Paternal and the Patriarchal Family.—At a certain stage, then, we find a great change in the organization of the family, which probably took place slowly and largely unconsciously. The family life becomes definitely organized about the male element, and the maternal system disappears. At first the paternal family appears with children taking the father's name and property and titles passing along the male line. Then there develops that extreme form of the paternal family which we know as the *patriarchal* family, in which the authority of the husband and father has become supreme and the position of the wife and children has been reduced, if not to that of property, at least to that of subject persons. Classical pictures of patriarchal family life may be found in the pages of the Old Testament. What, then, were the causes which brought about the breakdown of the maternal system and the gradual development, first of a paternal, and then of a patriarchal system? Some of these causes we can clearly make out from the study of social history.

(1) War was unquestionably a cause of the breakdown of the maternal system through the fact that women were captured in war, held as slaves, and made wives or concubines by their captors. These captured wives were regarded as the property of the captor. Any children born to them were, therefore, also regarded as the property of the captor. Furthermore, these captured wives were separated from their kindred, and their children could not possibly belong to any clan except their husband's. Manifestly this cause could not have worked in the earliest times, when slave captives were not valuable; but as soon as slavery became instituted in any form, then women slaves were particularly valued, not only for their labor, but because they might be either concubines or wives. It is evident, then, that war and slavery would thus indirectly tend to undermine the maternal system.

(2) Wife purchase would operate in the same way. Among peoples that had developed a commercial life as well as slavery it early became the practice to purchase wives. It is evident that these purchased wives would be regarded as a sort of property, and the husband would naturally claim the children as belonging to him. Among certain North American Indians we find exactly this state of affairs. If a man married a wife without paying the purchase price for her, then her children took her name and belonged to her clan; but if he had purchased her, say with a number of blankets, then the children took his name and belonged to his clan.

(3) The decisive cause, however, of the breakdown of the maternal system was the development of the pastoral stage of industry. Now, the grazing of flocks and herds requires considerable territory and necessitates small and compact groups widely separated from one another. Hence, in the pastoral stage the wife had to go with the husband and be far removed from the influence and authority of her own kindred. This gave the husband greater power over his wife. Moreover, the care of flocks and herds accentuated the value of the male laborer, while primitively woman had been the chief laborer. In the pastoral stage the man had the main burden of caring for the flocks and herds. Under such circumstances nothing was more natural than that the authority of the owner of the family property should gradually become supreme in all matters, and we find, therefore, among all pastoral peoples that the family is itself a little political unit, the children taking the father's name, property and authority passing down along the male line, while the eldest living male is usually the ruler of the whole group.

(4) After all these causes came another factor—ancestor worship. While ancestor worship exists to some extent among maternal peoples, it is usually not well-developed for some reason or other until the paternal stage is reached. Ancestor worship, being the worship of the departed ancestors as heroes, seems to develop more readily where the line of ancestors are males. It may be suggested that the male ancestor is apt to be a more heroic figure than the female ancestor.

At any rate, when ancestor worship became fully developed it powerfully tended to reinforce the authority of the patriarch, because he was, as the eldest living ancestor, the representative of the gods upon earth, so that his power became almost divine. Religion thus finally came in to place the patriarchal family upon a very firm basis.

Thus we see how each of these two great forms, the maternal family and the paternal family, arose out of cultural conditions, and therefore they may be said to represent two great stages in the evolution of man. It is hardly necessary to point out that civilized societies are now apparently entering upon a third stage, in which there will be relative equality given to the male and the female elements that go to make up the family.

Polyandry.—We must notice now the various forms of marriage by which the family has been constituted among different peoples and in different ages. Marriage, like the family itself, is variable, and an indefinite number of forms may be found among various peoples. We shall notice, however, only the three leading forms,—polyandry, polygyny, and monogamy,—and attempt to show the social conditions which favor each. It is evident that if we assume that the primitive form of the family was that of a simple pairing monogamy, the burden is laid upon us to find how such different types as polyandry and polygyny arose.

Polyandry, or the union of one woman with several men, is a relatively rare form of marriage and the family, found only in certain isolated regions of the world. It is particularly found in Tibet, a barren and inhospitable plateau lying north of India and adjoining China proper on the west. It is also found in certain other isolated mountainous regions in India, and down to recent times also in Arabia. In none of these places does it exist exclusively, but rather alongside of monogamy and perhaps other forms of the family. Thus in Tibet the upper classes practice polygyny and monogamy, while among the lower classes we find polyandry and monogamy. In all these regions where polyandry occurs, moreover, it is to be noted that the conditions of life are harsh and severe. Tibet is an exception-

ally inhospitable region, with a climate of arctic rigor, the people living mainly by grazing. Under such circumstances it is conceivably difficult for one man to support and protect a family. At any rate, the form of polyandry which we find in Tibet suggests that such economic conditions may have been the main cause of its existence. Ordinarily in Tibet a polyandrous family is formed by an older brother taking a wife, and then admitting his younger brothers into partnership with him. The older brother is frequently absent from home, looking after the flocks, and in his absence one of the younger brothers assumes the headship of the family. Under such circumstances we can see how the natural human "instinct" which would oppose polyandry under ordinary circumstances, namely, the jealousy of the male, might become greatly modified, or cease to act altogether. Certain other conditions besides economic ones might also favor the existence of polyandry, such as the scarcity of women.

Summing up, then, it should be noted that this rare form of the family seems to have as its causes: (1) In barren and inhospitable countries the labor of one man is sometimes found not sufficient to support a family. (2) Also there probably exists in such regions an excess of males. This excess might be due to one of two causes: First, the practice of exposing female infants might lead to a scarcity of women; secondly, in such regions it is found that from causes not well understood a larger number of males are born. It may be noted as a general fact that when the conditions of life are hard in human society, owing to famine, war, or barrenness of the soil, a larger number of male births take place, and this would disturb the numerical proportion of the sexes in such regions. (3) A third cause may be suggested as having something to do with the matter, namely, that habits of close inbreeding, or intermarriage, might perhaps tend to overcome the natural repugnance to such a relation. Moreover, close inbreeding also, as the experiments of stockbreeders show, would tend to produce a surplus of male births, and so would act finally in the same way as the second cause.

Polygyny,[1] or the union of one man with several women, is a much more common form of marriage. It is, in fact, to be found sporadically among all peoples and in all ages. It has perhaps existed at least sporadically from the most primitive times, because we find that at least one of the anthropoid apes, namely, the gorilla, practices it to some extent. It is manifest, however, that it could not have existed to any extent among primitive men, except where food supply was exceptionally abundant. In the main, polygyny is a later development, then, which comes in when some degree of wealth has been accumulated, that is, sufficient food supply to make it possible for one man to support several families. Polygyny came in especially after women came to be captured in war and kept as slaves or wives. The practice of wife capture, indeed, and the honor attached to the custom, had much to do in making the practice of polygyny common among certain peoples. Wherever slavery has existed, we may also note, polygyny, either in its legal form or in its illegal form of concubinage, has flourished. Polygyny, indeed, is closely related with the institution of slavery and is practically coextensive with it. In the ancient world it existed among the Hebrews and among practically all of the peoples of the Orient, and also sporadically among our own Teutonic ancestors. In modern times polygyny still exists among some Mohammedan peoples and to a greater or less degree among all semicivilized peoples. It exists in China in the form of concubinage. It even exists in the United States, in clandestine form. In 1852 polygamy (meaning polygyny) was proclaimed a doctrine of the Mormon Church and was practiced openly for many years; but it died out when the church withdrew its sanction of plural marriages in 1890.

Two facts always need to be borne in mind regarding polygyny: First, that wherever it is practiced it is relatively confined to the upper and wealthy classes, for the reason that the support of more

[1]The word "polygamy" is too broad in its meaning to use as a scientific term for this form of the family; it comes from two Greek words meaning "much married"; hence it includes "polyandry" (having several husbands) and "polygyny" (having several wives).

than one family is something which only the wealthy classes in a given society could assume. Secondly, it follows that under ordinary circumstances only a small minority of a given population practice polygyny, even in countries in which it is sanctioned. In Mohammedan countries such as Arabia and Egypt, for example, it is estimated that less than five per cent of the families are polygynous, while in other regions the percentage seems to be still smaller. The reason for this is not only the economic one just mentioned, but also that everywhere the sexes are relatively equal in numbers, and therefore it is impossible for polygyny to become a widespread general custom. If some men have more than one wife it is evident that other men will probably have to forego marriage entirely. This is not saying that under certain circumstances, namely, the importation of large numbers of women, a higher per cent of polygynous families may not exist. It is said that among the Negroes on the west coast of Africa the number of polygynous families reaches as high as fifty per cent, owing to the fact that female slaves are largely imported into that district, and that they serve not only as wives, but do the bulk of the agricultural labor, the male Negro preferring female slaves, who can do his work and be wives at the same time, to male slaves. But such cases as these are altogether exceptional and manifestly could not become general.

Summing up, note that the causes of polygyny are:

(1) First of all, the brutal lust of man. No doubt man's animal propensities have had much to do with the existence of this form of the family. Nevertheless, while male sensuality is at the basis of polygyny, it would be a mistake to think that sensuality is an adequate explanation in all cases. On the contrary, we find many other causes, chiefly, perhaps, economic, operating also to favor the development of polygyny.

(2) One of these is wife capture, as we have already seen. The captured women in war were held as trophies and slaves, and later became wives or concubines. Among all peoples at a certain stage the honor of wife capture has alone been a prolific cause of polygyny.

(3) Another cause, after slavery became developed, was the high value set on women as laborers. Among many barbarous peoples the women do the main part of the work. They are more tractable as slaves, and consequently a high value is set upon their labor. As we have already seen, these female slaves usually serve at the same time as concubines, if not legal wives of their masters.

(4) Another cause which we can perhaps hardly appreciate at the present time is the high valuation set on children. We see this cause operating particularly in the case of the patriarchs of the Old Testament. Under the patriarchal family great value was set upon children as necessary to continue the family line. Where the device of adoption was not resorted to, therefore, in case of barrenness or the birth exclusively of female children, nothing was more natural than that polygyny should be resorted to in order to insure the family succession. In the patriarchal family also a high valuation was necessarily set upon children, because the larger the family grew the stronger it was.

(5) Finally, religion came to sanction polygyny. The religious sanction of polygyny cannot be looked upon as one of its original causes, but when once established it reacted powerfully to reinforce and maintain the institution. How the religious sanction came about we can readily see when we remember that very commonly religions confuse the practice of the nobility with what is noble or commendable morally. The polygynous practices of the nobility, therefore, under certain conditions came to receive the sanction of religion. When this took place polygyny became firmly established as a social institution, very difficult to uproot, as all the experience of Christian missionaries among peoples practicing polygyny goes to show. Generally, also, while religion does not originate human institutions or the forms of human association, it is preëminently that which gives fixity and stability to institutions through the supernatural sanction that it accords them.

Some judgment of the social value of polygyny may not be out of place in connection with this subject. Admitting, as all students of social history must, that in certain times and places the polygynous

form of family has been advantageous, has served the interests of social survival and even of civilization, yet viewed from the standpoint of present society it seems that social judgment of polygyny must be wholly unfavorable. In the first place, as we have already seen, polygyny is essentially an institution of barbarism. It arose largely through the practice of wife capture and the keeping of female slaves. While often adjusted to the requirements of barbarous societies, it seems in no way adjusted to a high civilization. Polygyny, indeed, must necessarily rest upon the subjection and degradation of women. Necessarily the practice of polygyny must disregard the feelings of women, for women as well as men are jealous creatures. No high regard for the feelings of women, therefore, would be consistent with the practice of polygyny. Finally, all the evidence that we have goes to show that under polygyny children are neglected, and, at least from the standpoint of a high civilization, inadequately socialized. This must necessarily be so, because in the polygynous family the care of the children rests almost entirely with the mother. While we have no statistics of infant mortality from polygynous countries, it seems probable that infant mortality is high, and social workers in communities with polygynous families quite generally testify that many delinquent children are found in such households. Fatherhood, in the full sense of the word, can hardly be said to exist under polygyny.

Those philosophers, such as Schopenhauer, who advocate the legalizing of polygyny in civilized countries, are hardly worth replying to. It is safe to say that any widespread practice of polygyny in civilized communities would lead to a reversion to the moral standards of barbarism in many if not in all matters. That polygyny is still a burning question in the United States of the twentieth century is merely good evidence that we are not yet very far removed from barbarism.

Monogamy, as we have already seen, has been the prevalent form of marriage in all ages and in all countries. Wherever other forms have existed monogamy has existed alongside of them as the dominant, even though perhaps not the socially honored, form. All other forms of the family must be regarded as sporadic variations, on the whole

unsuited to long survival, because essentially inconsistent with the nature of human society. In civilized Europe monogamy has been the only form of the family sanctioned for ages by law, custom, and religion. The leading peoples of the world, therefore, practice monogamy, and it is safe to say that the connection between monogamy and progressive forms of civilization is not an accident.

What, then, are the social advantages of monogamy which favor the development of a higher type of culture? These advantages are numerous, but perhaps the most important of them can be grouped under six heads.

(1) The number of men is everywhere approximately equal to the number of women. This means that monogamy is in harmony with the biological conditions that exist in the human species. The tendency to equal numbers in the two sexes has probably been established through natural selection. Why nature should favor this proportion of the sexes can perhaps be in part understood when we reflect that with such proportion there can be the largest number of family groups, and hence the best possible care in the rearing of offspring.

(2) Monogamy secures the superior care of children in at least two respects. First, it very greatly decreases mortality in children, because under monogamy both husband and wife unite in their care. Again, monogamy secures the superior upbringing and, therefore, the superior socialization of the child. In the monogamous family much greater attention can be given to the training of children by both parents. In other forms of the family not only is the death rate higher among children, but from the point of view of modern civilization, at least, they are inferiorly socialized.

(3) The monogamous family alone produces affections and emotions of the higher type. It is only in the monogamous family that the highest type of altruistic affection can be cultivated. It is difficult to understand, for example, how anything like unselfish affection between husband and wife can exist under polygyny. Under monogamy, husband and wife are called upon to sacrifice selfish desires in the mutual care of children. Monogamy is, therefore, fitted as a form of the

family to foster altruism in the highest degree, and, as we have seen, the higher the type of altruism produced by the family life, the higher the type of the social life generally, other things being equal. It is especially to the credit of monogamy that it has created fatherhood in the fullest sense of the term, and therefore taught the male element in human society the value of service and self-sacrifice. Under polygynous conditions the father cannot devote himself to any extent to his children or to any one wife, since he is really the head of several households, and therefore, as has already been noted, fatherhood in the fullest sense scarcely exists under polygyny.

(4) Under monogamy, moreover, all family relationships are more definite and strong, and thus family bonds, and ultimately social bonds, are stronger. In the polygynous household the children of the different wives are half brothers and half sisters, hence family affection has little chance to develop among them, and as a matter of fact between children of different wives there is constant pulling and hauling. Moreover, because children in a polygynous family are only half brothers and half sisters, this immensely complicates relationships, and even the line of ancestors. Legal relations and all blood relationships are, therefore, more entangled. It is no inconsiderable social merit of monogamy that it makes blood relationships simple and usually perfectly definite. All of this has an effect upon society at large, because the cohesive power of blood relationship, even in modern societies, is something still worth taking into account. But of course the main influence of all this is to be found in the family group itself, because it is only under such simple and definite relations as we find in the monogamous family that there is ample stimulus to develop the higher family affections.

(5) From all this it follows that monogamy favors the development of high types of religion and morals, family affection being an indispensable root of any high type of ethical religion. That form of the family which favors the development of the highest type of this affection will, therefore, favor the development of the highest type of religion. We see this even more plainly, perhaps, in ancient times than

in the present time, because it was monogamy that favored the development of ancestor worship through making the line of ancestors clear and definite, and thus monogamy helped to develop this type of religion, which became the basis of still higher types.

(6) Monogamy not only favors the preservation of the lives of the children, but also, when stable, favors the preservation of the lives of the parents, because it is only under monogamy that we find aged parents best cared for by their children. Under polygyny the wife who has grown old is discarded for a young wife, and usually ends her days in bitterness. The father under polygyny may be reverenced by the children, but the polygynous household rarely gives the opportunity for close affections between either parent and children. That monogamy, therefore, helps to lengthen life through favoring care of parents by children in old age is an element in its favor, for it adds not a little to the happiness of life, and so to the strength of social bonds, that people do not have to look forward to a cheerless and friendless old age.

In brief, the monogamic family at its best presents such superior unity and harmony from every point of view that it is much more fitted to produce a higher type of culture. From whatever point of view we may look at it, therefore, there are many reasons why civilized societies cannot afford to sanction any other form of the family than that of monogamy.

Conclusions as to the Causes which Determine the Form of the Family and Society.—As we have already seen, the form of the family is undoubtedly greatly influenced by the form of industry. This is so markedly the case that some sociologists and economists have claimed that the form of the family life is but a reflection of the form of the industrial life; that the family in its changes and variations slavishly follows the changes in economic conditions. That such an extreme view as this is a mistake can readily be seen from a brief review of the causes which have produced certain types of family life in certain periods. Thus, the maternal type of the family cannot be said by any means to have been determined by economic conditions. On

the contrary, primarily the maternal family, as we have seen, was determined by certain intellectual conditions, namely, ignorance of the physiological connection between father and child, though the economic habits of primitive life tended powerfully to continue the maternal family long after intellectual conditions had changed. Again, it has been said that the patriarchal family owed its existence entirely to a form of industry, namely, pastoral industry, but, as we have seen, other factors also operated to produce the patriarchal type of the family, such as war, religion, and perhaps man's inherent desire to dominate. Moreover, religion continued the patriarchal family in many cases long after pastoral industry had ceased to be the chief economic form.

So too with the forms of marriage. While polygyny has been claimed to be due entirely to economic causes, we have seen that these so-called economic causes have only been the opportunities for the animal lust or polygynous "instinct" of man to assert itself. This polygynous tendency of man has asserted itself more or less under all conditions of society, but under certain conditions, when there was an accumulation of wealth, and especially with the institution of slavery, it had greater opportunity to assert itself than elsewhere. Thus the basic cause of polygyny is not economic, but psychological; and given certain moral and economic conditions of society, this polygynous tendency asserts itself. Monogamy, on the other hand, is fundamentally determined by the biological fact of the numerical equality of the sexes. This is doubtless the main reason why monogamy has been the prevalent form of the family everywhere. Certain moral and psychological factors which go along with the development of higher types of culture have, however, powerfully reinforced monogamy. It is doubtful if economic conditions can to any extent be shown to have equally reinforced the monogamic life.

Our conclusion must be, then, that the family and all other human relations are determined, not by economic forces alone, though these are influential, but by all the active factors in human association, geographic, economic, intellectual, moral, and cultural.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

LOWIE, R. H., *Primitive Society*, Chaps. I, III.
HARTLAND, E. S., *Primitive Society*, Chaps. I, XII.
HOBHOUSE, L. T., *Morals in Evolution*, Chap. IV.

For more extended reading:

BRIFFAULT, R., *T Mothers*, Vol. II.
GOODSELL, W., *A History of Marriage and the Family*, Chap. I.
HOWARD, G. E., *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, Vol. I, Chaps. II, IV.
WESTERMARCK, E., *A Short History of Marriage*, Chaps. IX-X.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why do we find different forms of social institutions among different peoples and in different ages?

2. Describe the form of the family known as "the maternal or metronymic family."

3. Was it ever truly "matriarchal"? Illustrate.

4. What were the causes which produced this type of family life?

5. Why did it not change with the change of knowledge of physiological facts?

6. What is "the paternal family"? The patriarchal family?

7. Assuming that the maternal family was primitive, what were the causes which brought about the transition from the maternal to the paternal, and finally to the patriarchal form?

8. If we conclude that the primitive form of the family was that of a pairing monogamy, how can we explain the origin of other forms?

9. Illustrate by showing the causes of polyandry.

10. Illustrate by showing how the wealthy in some cases came to practice polygyny.

11. Why is polygyny unadapted to a high civilization?

12. Why is permanent monogamy alone among the forms of family life adapted to promote the highest civilization?

For classroom discussion:

1. Are the variations in the forms of the family due to natural or cultural conditions?

2. Why is polyandry (found in only four regions on the earth) such a rare form of the family while polygyny has been so common?

3. Are the advantages of monogamy mainly natural (biological) or cultural?

4. Can the forms of the family be explained adequately through economic conditions?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Why has the monogamic pattern for family life been associated with Western civilization (*i.e.*, the civilization of Europe and America)?

CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FAMILY

WHILE we cannot study the historical evolution of the family as an institution among the many different civilized peoples, still it will be profitable for us to consider the history of the family among some single representative people in order that we may see the forces which have made and unmade the family life, and incidentally also, to a great degree, the general social life of that people.

The ancient Romans were among the earliest civilized of the European peoples, and their institutions are, therefore, of peculiar interest to us as representing approximately the early European type. They are of especial interest also because the Romans furnished us the framework of our government and laws. What is learned concerning Roman family life, moreover, will apply with some modifications and qualifications to the early family life of other European peoples, especially the Greeks. The Greeks and the Romans, indeed, were so closely related in their early culture that for the purpose of institutional history they may be considered practically one people. The Greeks developed earlier and set the great traditions for European civilization in art and philosophy. While the family life of the ancient Hebrews is also of particular interest to us, because they gave their religion and ethics to the European world—a religion and ethics which were essentially an expansion and idealization of the family life at its best—yet in the family life of the ancient Romans constructive and destructive factors are more clearly marked, and it is for this reason that the study of the history of ancient Roman family life is best fitted to bring out these factors. Without any attempt then to sketch the history of the family as an institution in general, let us note for

the illustration of sociological principles some of the active factors in the family life of the ancient Romans.

The Early Roman Family.—(1) *Ancestor Worship as the Basis of the Early Roman Family.* What has been said thus far indicates a close connection between the family life and religion among all peoples. This was especially true of the early Romans. It may be said, indeed, that ancestor worship was the constitutive principle of their family life. Among them the family seemed to have lost in part its character as a purely social institution and to have become specialized into a religious institution. At any rate, the early Roman family existed very largely for the sake of perpetuating the worship of ancestors. Of course, ancestor worship could have had nothing to do with the origin of the family life among the Romans. The type of their family life was patriarchal, and we have already noticed the causes which brought about the existence of the patriarchal family. But while ancestor worship had nothing to do with the origin of the family, once it was thoroughly established it became the basis of the family life and transformed the family as an institution.

The early Romans shared certain superstitions with many primitive peoples, which, if not the basis of ancestor worship, powerfully reinforced it. They believed, for example, that the soul continued in existence after death, and that persons would be unhappy unless buried in tombs with suitable offerings, and that if left unburied, or without suitable offerings, the souls of these persons would return to torment the living. Inasmuch as in the patriarchal family only sons could perform religious rites, that is, could make offerings to the departed spirits, these superstitions acted as a powerful stimulus to preserve the family in order that offerings might continue to be made at the graves of ancestors.

Thus, as already said, among the early Romans the family was practically a religious institution with ancestor worship as its constitutive principle. It is supposed by de Coulanges that in the earliest times the dead ancestors were buried beneath the hearth. At any rate, the hearth was the place where offerings were made to the de-

parted ancestors, and the flame on the hearth was believed to represent the spirit of the departed. The house under such circumstances became a temple and the whole atmosphere of the family life was necessarily a religious one.

(2) *The Authority in the Early Roman Family* was vested, as in all patriarchal families, in the father or eldest living male of the family group. Under ancestor worship he became the living representative of the departed ancestors, the link between the living and the dead. Here we may note that the family was not considered as constituted simply of its living members, but that it included also all of its dead members. Inasmuch as the dead were more numerous and were thought to be more powerful than the living, they were by far the more important element in the life of the family. The position of the house father, as representative of the departed ancestors, and as the link between the living and the dead, naturally made his authority almost divine. Hence, the house father was himself, then, almost a deity, having absolute power over all persons within the group, even to the extent of life and death. This absolute power, which was known in the early Roman family as the "patria potestas," could not, however, be exercised arbitrarily. The house father, as representative of the departed ancestors, was necessarily controlled by religious scruples and traditions. It was impossible for him to act other than for what he believed to be the will of the ancestors. Disobedience to him was, therefore, disobedience to the divine ancestors, and hence was sacrilegious.

(3) *Relationship in the Early Roman Family* was determined by community of worship, inasmuch as only descendants upon the male side could perform religious rites, and inasmuch as married women worshiped the household gods of their husbands' ancestors; therefore, only descendants on the male side could worship the same ancestors and were relatives in the full religious and legal sense. These were known as "agnates." Later, some relationship on the mother's side came to be recognized, but relatives on the mother's side were known as "cognates," and for a long time property could not pass to them.

Indeed, in the earliest times the property of the family, as has already been implied, was kept as a unit, held in trust by the eldest living member of the family group for the good of all the family. In other words, the house father in earliest times did not possess the right to make a will, but the property of the family passed intact from him to his eldest male heir.

(4) *The Marriage Ceremony among the Early Romans* was necessarily of a religious charcter. It was constituted essentially of the induction of the bride into the worship of her husband's ancestors. But before this could be done the bride's father had first to free her from the worship of her household gods, in later times a certificate of manumission being given not unlike the manumission of a slave. After the bride had been released from the worship of her father's ancestors, the bridegroom and his friends brought her to his father's house, where a ceremony of adoption was practically gone through with, adopting the bride into the family of her husband. The essence of this ceremony, as already said, was the induction of the bride into the worship of her husband's ancestors, and this was done through their both making an offering on the family hearth and eating a sacrificial meal together. After that the wife worshiped at her husband's altar and had no claim upon the household gods of her father.

(5) *Divorce.* Under such circumstances it is not surprising that marriage was practically indissoluble. A wife who was driven out of her husband's household, or who deserted, was without family gods of any sort, having no claim upon those of her husband, and became, therefore, a social outcast. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that divorce was practically unknown. It is said, indeed, that for five hundred and twenty years after Rome was founded there was not a single divorce in Rome. While this may be an exaggeration, it is historically certain that divorce was so rare in early Rome as to be practically unknown.

(6) *Adoption.* In case of a failure of sons to be born there was no taking of a second wife, as among the Hebrews. Polygyny was unknown in early Rome. The Roman device to prevent the failure of

the family succession was adoption. Younger sons of other families were adopted if no sons were born, and these adopted sons, taking the family name, became the same legally as sons by birth. Inasmuch as the position of younger sons in the patriarchal household was not an enviable one there was never lack of candidates for the position of eldest son in some family group in which no sons had been born.

Not only was the early Roman family life the most stable that the world has ever known, but it was also of a relatively pure type. Chastity was rigidly enforced among the women, but of course, as in all primitive peoples, was not enforced among the men. Still it was expected that the married men at least should remain relatively faithful to their wives. On the whole, therefore, the early Roman family life must be judged to have been of a singularly high and stable type. While the position of women and children in the early Roman family was one of subjection, the family itself was nevertheless of a high type.

(7) *The Decadence.* But it was inevitable that this type of family should decay, and this decay began comparatively early. Inasmuch as the early Roman family was based upon ancestor worship, a religion which was fitted for relatively small isolated groups, it was inevitable that the family life should decay with this ancestor worship. How early the decay of ancestor worship began it is impossible to say. Perhaps the nature gods, Jupiter, Venus, and the rest, existed alongside of ancestor worship from the earliest times. At any rate, we find their worship growing rapidly within the period of authentic history and undermining the domestic worship, while at a still later period skeptical philosophy undermined both religions. Along with the decay of ancestor worship went many economic and political changes which marked the dissolution of the patriarchal family. Let us see what some of the first steps in this decadence were.

(8) *Steps in the Decadence.* (*a*) One of the earliest steps toward the breaking down of the patriarchal family was the limiting of the power of the house father. This took place very early—as soon as the Council of Elders, or Senate, was formed to look after matters of collective

interest. Gradually the paternal power diminished, until it was confined to matters concerning the family group proper.

(*b*) A second step was when the right to make a will was conceded. This right, as we have seen, did not exist in the earliest Roman times, but with the development of property and of a more complex economic life the house father was given the right to divide his property among his children, at first only on the male side, but later among any of his children, and still later to bequeath it to whom he pleased.

(*c*) Thus women came to be given the right to hold property, a thing which was unknown in the earliest times; and becoming property holders, their other rights in many respects began to increase. Originally the wife had no right to divorce her husband, but in the second century B.C. women also gained the right of divorcing their husbands.

(*d*) The rights of children were increased along with the rights of women, particularly of younger children.

(*e*) The right of plebeians to intermarry with the noble families became recognized. All of these changes we should perhaps regard as good in themselves, but they nevertheless marked the disintegration of the patriarchal family. The decay of the family life did not stop with these changes, however, but went on to the decay of the family bonds themselves.

Later Roman Family Life.—By the beginning of the Christian era the relations between the sexes had become very loose. Men not only frequently divorced their wives, but women frequently divorced their husbands. Indeed, a complete revolution passed over the Roman family. Marriage became a private contract, whereas, as we have seen, in the beginning it was a religious bond. Many loose forms of marriage were developed, which amounted practically to temporary marriages. In all cases it was easy for a husband or wife to divorce the other for very trivial causes. Among certain classes of Roman society the instability of the family became so great that we find Seneca saying that there were women who reckoned their years by

their husbands, and Juvenal recording one woman as having eight husbands in five years.

Women and children achieved their practical emancipation, as we would say. Women, especially, were free to do as they saw fit. Marriages were formed and dissolved at pleasure among certain classes, and among all classes the instability of the family life had become very great.

Along with all this, of course, went a growth of vice. It is not too much to say that the Romans of the first and second centuries A.D. approached as closely to a condition of promiscuity as any civilized people of which we have knowledge.

Causes of the Decadence. When we examine the causes of this great revolution in Roman family life from the austere morals and stable family of the early Romans to the laxity and promiscuity of the later Romans, we find that these causes can perhaps be grouped under four principal heads:

(1) First among all the causes was the destruction of the domestic religion, namely, ancestor worship, largely through the growth of nature worship and skeptical philosophy. The destruction of the domestic religion necessarily shattered the foundations of the Roman family, since, as we have already seen, there was the closest connection between the family life of the early Romans and ancestor worship. But it is not probable that ancestor worship was destroyed merely through the growth of nature worship and skeptical philosophy. As we have already seen, it was a religion which was mainly adapted to isolated groups. Changes in economic and political conditions, therefore, were to some extent prior to the decay of the domestic religion.

(2) Changes in economic conditions, that is, in the form of industry, were, then, among the more important causes of the decay of the early Roman family. The patriarchal family belonged essentially to the pastoral stage of industry, and as soon as settled agricultural life, commerce, and manufacturing industry developed, this destroyed the isolated patriarchal groups, and so also in time affected even the religion which was their basis. Again, the growth of cities going along with

these changes in the methods of obtaining a living destroyed the old conditions under which the family had been the social and political unit.

(3) We have therefore as a third cause the breaking up of old political conditions. Family groups were welded into small cities and the authority of the patriarch was destroyed. Legislation designed to meet the new social conditions, especially such as we have already noted in the steps of the decadence, profoundly affected the whole family group and weakened family bonds.

(4) The growth of divorce and of vice may be put down as a fourth cause of the decay of the Roman family. Some may say that this was an effect of the decay of the Roman family rather than a cause, but it was also a cause as well as an effect, for it is a peculiarity of social life that what is at one stage an effect reacts to become a cause at a later stage; and this was certainly the case with the growth of divorce and vice in Rome, in its effect upon the Roman family. Moreover, much of this came from Greece through imitation. The family life had decayed in Greece much earlier than it had in Rome, and when Rome conquered Greece it annexed its vices also. While the most radical social changes do not usually come about merely through imitation, yet the imitation of a foreign people is frequently, in the history of a particular nation, one of the most potent causes in bringing about social changes. It was certainly so in the case of the growth of divorce and vice in Rome.

Conclusions as to the Causes of Social Change.—We see that the causes of the decay of the Roman family life were very complex. This is true of all important social changes. It is impossible to reduce the causes of these changes to any single principle or set of causes. While changes in economic conditions were undoubtedly very influential in bringing about the profound changes in the Roman family, still we have no ground for regarding the economic changes as determinative of all the rest. We know as yet little of the development of industry in antiquity. What little we do know, however, furnishes good ground for claiming that changes in the methods of getting a living are among the most influential causes of social change in general;

but there is nothing which warrants the sweeping generalization of Karl Marx and his followers, "that the method of the production of the material life determines the social, political, and spiritual life process in general." On the contrary, the evolution of the Roman family clearly shows moral and psychological factors at work quite independent of economic causes. The decay of ancestor worship, for example, cannot be wholly attributed to the change in the method of getting a living. The very growth of population and accompanying changes in political conditions probably had quite as much to do with the undermining of ancestor worship. Moreover, while religion may not be an original determining cause of social forms, it is, nevertheless, as we have already seen, an influence that gives them stability and permanency, so much so that the life history of a culture is frequently the life history of a religion. The decay of religious ideas and beliefs, therefore, from any cause, frequently proves the important element working for social change in all societies. So, too, changes in political conditions, especially changes in law through new legislation, frequently prove a profound modifying influence in societies. Lastly, there are certain moral causes inherent in the individual oftentimes involving perverted expressions of "instinct," which lead to profound social changes. Such was the vice which Rome copied very largely from Greece, but which proved the final solvent in its family life.

In general it is evident, then, that there is no single principle which will explain the evolution of the family from the earliest times down to the present. Any attempt to reduce the evolution of the family to a single principle, or to show that it has been controlled by a single set of causes, must inevitably end in failure. The economic determinism of Marx and his followers, the ideological conceptions of Hegel, the geographical influences of Buckle and his school, and like explanations, are all found wanting when they are applied to the actual history of the family. It is not different with the theories of recent sociologists, who would strive to explain all social changes through a single principle. Unilateral sociological principles, such as "Habit," "Environment," "Imitation," and "Consciousness of Kind" will not go further

in explaining the changes in the family life than some of the older principles that have just been mentioned. *Human life is*, indeed, *too complex to be explained in terms of any single principle or any single set of causes.* The family in particular is an organic structure which responds first to one set of stimuli and then to another. Now it is modified by economic conditions, now by religious ideas, now by legislation, now by imitation, and so on through the whole set of possible stimuli which may impinge upon and modify the activity of a living organism. So it is with all institutions.

The Influence of Christianity upon the Family.—While we need not study further the historical evolution of the family in any detail, still it is necessary, in order to avoid too great discontinuity, to notice in a few sentences the influence of Christianity upon the family in Western civilization.

Early Christianity, as we have already seen, found the family life of the Greco-Roman world demoralized. The reconstruction of the family became, therefore, one of the first tasks of the new religion, and while other circumstances may have aided the church in this work, still on the whole it was mainly the influence of the early church that reconstituted the family life. At least four effects of early Christianity upon the family should be noted:

(1) From the first the church worked to abolish divorce, and fought as evil such vices as concubinage and prostitution, that came to flourish to such an extent in the Pagan world. Only very slowly did the early leaders of the church win the mass of the people to accepting their views as to the permanency of the marriage bond. In order to aid in making this bond more stable the early church recognized marriage as one of the sacraments, and, as implied, steadily opposed the idea of the later Roman law that marriage was simply a private contract. The result was, eventually, that marriage came to be regarded again as a religious bond, and the family life took on once more the aspect of great stability. After the church had come fully into power in the Western world, legal divorce ceased to be recognized and legal separation was substituted in its stead.

(2) Thus the church succeeded in reconstituting the family life upon a stable basis, but the family, after being reconstituted, was of a semipatriarchal type. The husband was the head of the family, with much more authority than the wife. Nothing was more natural than this, for the church had no model to go by except the paternal family of the Hebrew and Greek and Roman civilization.

(3) Nevertheless, the place of women and children in this semipatriarchal religious family established by the church was higher on the whole than in the ancient patriarchal family. The church put an end to the exposure of children, which had been common in Rome, and protected childhood in many ways.

(4) The church elevated the place of woman in the family, though leaving her subject to her husband. The veneration of the Virgin tended particularly to give women an honored place socially and religiously, but by the advocacy and practice of ascetic doctrines the early church may be said to have detracted from the social valuation of the family.

On the whole, the reconstituting of the family by the early church must be regarded as its most striking social work. But the thing for us to note particularly is that the type of the family life created by the church was a semipatriarchal type, in which the importance of husband and father was very much out of proportion to all the rest of the members of the family group. It was this semipatriarchal family which persisted down to the nineteenth century.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

FUSTEL DE COULANGES, N. D., *The Ancient City*, Chaps. I-X.

GOODSELL, W., *A History of Marriage and the Family*, 2nd Ed., Chaps. II-IV.

For more extended reading:

HEARN, W. E., *The Aryan Household.*

HOWARD, G. E., *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, Vol. I.

LECKY, W. H., *History of European Morals*, Chap. V.
SCHMIEDELER, E., *An Introductory Study of the Family*, Part I.

On the early Hebrew Family:

MCCURDY, J. F., *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, Vol. II.
SCHAEFFER, H., *Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites*, Chaps. I-III.

On the early Teutonic Family:

GUMMERE, F. B., *Germanic Origins*, Chaps. V-VI.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why do we have to have continual changes in the forms and institutions of human society?
2. Describe the early Roman family life.
3. What were some of the prominent changes in early Roman society which we may regard as steps in decadence of this early type of the family?
4. Describe the later Roman family life.
5. What sets of causes operated to bring about the changes from the early Roman to the later Roman family life?
6. Were these changes consciously brought about (planned)?
7. What can you say about the complexity of the causes of social changes in general?
8. What changes did early Christianity effect in the family life of Europe? Were these changes consciously brought about (planned)?

For classroom discussion:

1. Are all human institutions historical products?
2. Why are Greco-Roman institutions of peculiar importance to us?
3. What made the early Roman family "the most stable the world has known"?
4. What can we learn about cultural decadence (social disintegration) from the history of the later Roman family?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Was the early Christian movement essentially a social movement?

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROBLEM OF THE MODERN FAMILY

PASSING over the changes which affected the family during the Middle Ages, and the still more striking changes which came through the Reformation, let us now turn to the study of the problem of the family in the modern world.

Peculiarities of Modern Civilization.—We must note some of the great movements which have made modern civilization what it is in its moral aspects. The *first* of these is the rise of individualism and the decline of authority. This movement began, or rather had its first manifestation, in the Protestant Reformation. In the latter years of the eighteenth century it culminated in the French Revolution, and in the subsequent rise of political democracy among all European peoples. This growth of individualism and decline of authority has continued down to the present, until both religious and political authority are perhaps less in the civilized world of to-day than ever before in the history of Western civilization. The result of this upon the family has been that the authoritarian type of the family has tended to disappear. The religious theory of the family which prevailed during the Middle Ages, but which was more or less undermined by the Reformation, has given place among large classes of the population to the view that marriage is a private contract. This view of the family has even been embodied to a large extent in our laws.

The *second* great influence which has affected modern civilization is the revolution in industry, owing to the invention of machinery and the rise of the factory system. This has tended, as we have already seen, to destroy the economic functions of the family and to individualize its members in their economic activities. The individ-

ual, in other words, has become the unit in production as well as the political unit. This has tended to destroy the social cohesion between the members of the family group and has even to some extent placed the sexes in competition with each other.

A *third* influence greatly affecting modern civilization has been the enormous growth of wealth which has resulted from the introduction of machine industry. While this wealth has not extended to all classes of society, it has emancipated certain classes from the fear of want, a factor which in the past put an effective restraint upon conduct. The growth of wealth, in other words, has favored, in certain classes at least, lower moral standards, and increasing laxity in family relations.

A *fourth* movement which has been supremely important in modern civilization has been the development of physical science. Both the machine age and the growth of wealth have been largely the result of the mastery of the forces of nature which physical science has made possible. Thus the physical sciences have made the comforts and conveniences of life not only accessible to greater numbers of men than ever before, but they have also made these the chief rewards of effort. Moreover, the physical sciences, through their very methods of interrogating nature and through their insistence that the only evidence which can be accepted is the evidence of the senses, have stimulated a critical attitude toward all human institutions. It is not too much to say that this critical attitude has resulted in the undermining of many cherished beliefs upon which these institutions were based in the past.

Owing to these and many minor causes the nineteenth century was a period of great social change and unrest. It was a period of social disintegration and of social reconstruction, as yet far from complete. Now, in such periods of social disintegration, confusion and instability in institutions are apt to manifest themselves, until some new basis for a stable social order can be found. While the forces making for social dissolution manifested themselves comparatively late in the family, the modern family has suddenly found itself confronted with

the need of social readjustment and in the midst of change and confusion.

The Problem of the Family.—Thus it happens that we find the family life of the twentieth century in many countries in a more unstable condition than it has been at any other time since the beginning of the Christian Era. Now, any great instability of the family is manifestly inconsistent with the idea of permanent monogamy. Hence the problem of the modern family is whether permanent monogamy shall continue to exist or to be the standard in Western civilization. There are many who do not hesitate to say that the family, in its present form of permanent monogamy, will soon pass away. While such a statement is wholly unwarranted from a scientific standpoint, the student of the family cannot fail to see that the crux of the problem of the modern family lies in its instability.

The legal expression of the instability of the family is to be seen in divorce. If the whole problem of the modern family centers in the matter of its instability, then the study of the divorce movement should throw more light upon the condition of the modern family than the study of anything else. Just how far we have gone already toward getting rid of permanent monogamy as the standard in modern society will be more or less evident from the divorce statistics. However, the student must bear in mind that divorce statistics never adequately measure the instability of the family life, for divorce is only the legal expression of such instability. In every community a certain number of marriages are dissolved without the formality of legal divorce. Among the very poorest class in American cities, it is found that illegal desertion is about four times as common as legal divorce. Hence it has been reliably estimated that the total desertions in the United States are in excess of 50,000 annually. This number must be added to the number of divorces granted to get an approximate measure of the real instability of the family in American society.

As implied by the above, the instability of the modern family is especially evident in the United States. This is due in part to the

freedom with which legal divorce has been granted in the United States; but it is also due in part to the fact that American society has exaggerated the individualism and industrialism which are characteristic of Western civilization in general. Hence, although the disintegration of the family characterizes more or less all modern civilization, it is particularly American conditions that will concern us, because they illustrate best the tendencies of modern society in respect to the family.

Without devoting too much time to the consideration of divorce statistics in their technical aspects, let us note, then, some of the main outlines of the modern divorce movement in this and other civilized countries.

Statistics of Divorce in the United States and Other Civilized Countries.—For many years the United States has led the world in the number of its divorces. Already in 1885 this country had more divorces than all the rest of the Christian civilized world put together. These statistics of the number of divorces granted in different civilized countries in 1885 (taken from Professor W. F. Willcox's monograph on *The Divorce Problem*) are of sufficient interest to cite at length:

United States	23,472	Great Britain and Ireland	508
France	6,245	Rumania	541
Germany	6,161	Holland	339
Russia	1,789	Belgium	290
Austria	1,718	Sweden	229
Switzerland	920	Australia	100
Denmark	635	Norway	68
Italy	556	Canada	12

It will be noted that in this particular year (1885) when the United States had 23,472 divorces, all the other countries mentioned together had only 20,131.

In 1927 the United States had 192,037 divorces, which was exceeded only by Soviet Russia, which was reported to have had that year 342,924 divorces, or one divorce to every 3.8 marriages. All the rest of the Christian civilized world in 1927 had less than 90,000.

The following statistics are available for the years indicated:

United States (1937)	249,000	Czechoslovakia (1937)	5,373
Germany (1937)	46,786	Sweden (1937)	3,636
Japan (1937)	46,500	Switzerland (1937)	3,379
France (1937)	23,614	Denmark (1937)	3,344
Rumania (1937)	12,380	Belgium (1937)	3,208
Austria (1936)	6,280	Canada (1937)	1,842
Great Britain (1937)	5,535	Norway (1937)	1,046

Recent statistics for Russia are not available, but it is known that the large number reported for 1927 was very unusual, and no doubt the usual number there is smaller than that for the United States. It is evident that the number of divorces has been rapidly increasing in all other civilized nations. The above statistics show that in Austria there was one divorce to seven marriages, in Switzerland one to nine, in Denmark one to ten, in France and in Japan one to twelve, in Germany one to fourteen, in Sweden and in Rumania one to fifteen, in Belgium one to twenty-one, in Norway one to twenty-three, in Czechoslovakia one to twenty-four, in Canada one to forty-two, in Great Britain one to seventy-two; but in the United States the rate in 1937 was one divorce to 5.8 marriages. In Wyoming in 1937 there was one divorce to every 2.3 marriages, in California one to 2.7, in Oregon one to 2.8, in Texas one to 3.1, in Florida one to 3.2, in Ohio one to 3.5, in Oklahoma one to 3.6, in Missouri one to 4.4, in Montana one to 4.5, in Colorado one to 4.7, in Maine one to 4.9, in Kansas one to 5.2. While these rates are those of some of the states in which divorce is most common, yet the number of states in which the divorce rate ranges from one to every 4 marriages to one to 7 marriages are so numerous that they may be said to be fairly representative of American conditions. The divorce census for 1940 gave returns very similar to those of 1937, except that in the intervening period the number of divorces increased to 264,000. In 1932 the number of divorces granted was only 160,338, as divorces decrease in depressions. Some states in 1916, however, already had as high divorce rates as in 1937. Thus in Oregon in 1916 there was already one divorce to every 2.5 marriages, and in Washington one to every 4 marriages.

Increase of Divorces in the United States. Not only does the United States lead the world in the number of its divorces, but divorces are increasing in this country much more rapidly than the population. In 1867, the first year for which statistics for the country as a whole were gathered, there were 9937 divorces in the United States, but by 1940, the peak year for our divorce statistics, the total number of divorces granted in this country, yearly, had reached 264,000. Again, from 1867 to 1886 there were 328,716 divorces granted in the United States, but during the next twenty years, from 1887 to 1906, the number reached 945,625. Again, from 1906 to 1940 the number of divorces increased 266 per cent, while the population increased only about 55 per cent; and from 1930 to 1940 the number of divorces increased 37 per cent, while the population increased only 7.2 per cent. Thus it appears that divorces are probably now increasing in the United States about five times as fast as the increase of population.

It becomes, therefore, a matter of some curious interest to speculate upon what will be the end of this movement. If divorces should continue to increase as they have increased during the past fifty years, it is evident that it would not be long before more marriages would be terminated by divorce than by death. In 1870, 3.5 per cent of all marriages were terminated by divorce; in 1900, 8.1 per cent were terminated by divorce; and in 1940, 16.9 per cent. Before the beginning of the twentieth century Professor Willcox estimated that if the divorce rate continued to increase, by 1990 one half of all the marriages in the United States will be terminated by divorce. Thus we are apparently within measurable distance of a time when, if present tendencies continue, the family will not be considered as a probably permanent union between husband and wife, lasting until death. And if primary groups are as important as alleged in Chapter IV for the socialization of the individual and the preservation of the higher values of civilization, the increasing instability of the family will threaten us with general social demoralization. Without, however, stopping at this point to discuss the results or the effects of the divorce movement upon society, let us now consider for a moment

how these divorces are distributed among the various elements and classes of our population.

Distribution of Divorces. It is usually thought by those who have observed the matter most carefully that divorce especially characterizes the wealthy classes and the laboring classes, but is least common among the middle classes. We have no statistics to bear out this belief, but it seems probable that it is substantially correct. The divorce statistics which we have, however, indicate certain striking differences in the distribution of divorces by classes and communities.

(1) The divorce rate is higher in the cities than in their surrounding country districts. The statistics show, for example, that in many cities in the Central West the divorce rates are much higher than in the states in which they are situated. Exceptions to this generalization are cities in which a large proportion of the population are Roman Catholic or of foreign birth.

(2) The census statistics show that apparently the divorce rate is about eight times as high for childless couples as for couples that have children. This doubtless does not mean that domestic unhappiness is eight times more common in families where there are no children than in families that have children, but it does show, nevertheless, that the child is now, as in primitive times, a powerful force to bind husband and wife together.

(3) While we have no statistics from this country telling us exactly what the distribution of divorces is among the various religious denominations, still we know that because the Roman Catholic Church is strongly against divorce, divorces are very rare in that denomination. In Switzerland, where the number of divorces among Protestants and Catholics has been noted, it is found that divorces are four times as common among Protestants as among Catholics. Some observers in this country have claimed that divorces are most common among those of no religious profession, next most common among Protestants, next among Jews, and least common among Roman Catholics.

(4) From this we might expect, as our statistics indicate, that the divorce rate is much higher among the native whites in this country

than it is among the foreign-born, for many of the foreign-born are Roman Catholics, and, in any case, they come from countries where divorce is less common than in the United States.

(5) For the last sixty years two thirds of all divorces have been granted on demand of the wife. This may indicate, on the one hand, that the increase of divorces is a movement connected with the emancipation of woman, and on the other hand it may indicate that it is the husband who most often gives the ground for divorce.

(6) The census statistics show three great centers of divorce in the United States. One is the New England states, one the states of the Central West, and one the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast states. These three regions are also typical centers of American institutions and ideas. The individualism of the New England, the Central West, and the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast regions has always been marked in comparison with some other sections of the country. But since about 1900 divorce has also been increasing rapidly in the Southern states, and we now find such states as Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma well up toward the front among the states with a high divorce rate.

This distribution of divorces among the various elements and classes of the country suggests something as to the causes of divorce, and this will come out fully later in a discussion of the causes of the increase of divorce.

The Grounds for Granting Divorce.—There are no less than thirty-six distinct grounds for absolute divorce recognized by the laws of the several states, ranging from only one ground recognized in New York to fourteen grounds recognized in New Hampshire. For this reason some have supposed that many of the divorces in this country are granted on comparatively trivial grounds. Several states have, for example, what is known as an "Omnibus Clause," granting divorce for mere incompatibility and the like. But the examination of divorce statistics shows that very few divorces are granted on trivial grounds. On the contrary, most divorces seem to be granted for grave reasons, such as adultery, desertion, cruelty, imprisonment for crime,

habitual drunkenness, and neglect on the part of the husband to provide for his family. These are usually recognized as grave reasons for the dissolution of the marriage tie. None of them at least could be said to be trivial. Professor Willcox showed that for the twenty-year period 1867 to 1886, over ninety-seven per cent of all divorces were granted for these six principal causes. Moreover, he also showed that over sixty per cent were granted for the two most serious causes of all,—adultery and desertion. Again, of the one million divorces granted from 1887 to 1906 over ninety-four per cent were granted for the six principal causes, with over fifty-five per cent for adultery and desertion, while in still other cases adultery and desertion figured in combination with other causes (a total of over sixty-two per cent in all). Therefore, it seems probable that in nearly two thirds of the cases the marriage bond had already practically been dissolved before the courts stepped in to make the dissolution formal. We must conclude, therefore, that divorce is prevalent not because of the laxity of our laws, but rather because of the decay of our family life; that divorce is but a symptom of the disintegration of the modern family, particularly the American family.

The Instability of the Family.—In other words, divorce is but a symptom of more serious evils, and these evils have in certain classes of American society apparently undermined the very virtues upon which the family life subsists. This is not saying that sex immorality is more prevalent to-day than it was fifty years ago. We have some statistics which seem to indicate this, but there may well be a difference of opinion upon such a subject. It is the opinion of some authorities that there has been no growth of immorality in the United States along with the growth of divorce, but this would seem to be doubtful. The very causes for which divorce is granted suggest a demoralization of certain social classes. While there may not have been, therefore, any general growth of sex immorality in the United States along with the growth of divorce, it is conceivable that it may have increased greatly in certain classes of American society. Be this as it may, it is not necessary to assume that there has been any growth of immorality in

the American population, for if actual moral practices are no higher than they were fifty years ago that alone would be a sufficient reason to explain considerable disintegration of our family life. It is an important truth in sociology that the morality which suffices for a relatively simple social life, largely rural, such as existed in this country seventy years ago, is not sufficient for a more complex society which is largely urban, such as exists at the present time. Moreover, recognized moral standards within the past seventy years have largely been raised through the growth of general intelligence. It follows that immoral acts which were condoned seventy years ago and which produced but slight social effect, to-day meet with great reprobation and have far greater social consequences than a generation ago. This is particularly true of the standards which the wife imposes upon the husband. For centuries, as we have already seen, the husband has secured divorce for adultery of the wife, but for centuries no divorce was given to the wife for the adultery of the husband; and this is even true to-day in modern England, unless the adultery of the husband is accompanied by other flagrant violations of morality. Conduct on the part of the husband, which the wife overlooked, therefore, two generations ago, is to-day sufficient to disrupt the family bonds and become a ground for the granting of a divorce. Even if sexual immorality, then, has not increased in our population, if moral practices are no higher to-day than fifty years ago, we should expect that this alone would have far different consequences now than then. The growth of intelligence and of higher and more complex forms of social organization necessitates realization of higher standards of conduct if the institutions of society are to retain their stability.

But there are grave reasons for believing that there has been in certain classes of society a decay of the very virtues upon which the family rests; for family life requires not only chastity, but even more the virtues of self-sacrifice, loyalty, obedience, and self-subordination. Now there is abundant evidence to show that these particular virtues which belong to a self-subordinating life are those which have suffered most in the changes and new adjustments of modern society. We have

replaced these virtues largely by those of self-interest, self-direction, and self-assertiveness.

Causes of the Increasing Instability of the Family in the United States.—Let us note somewhat more in detail the causes of the increased instability of the American family during the past six or eight decades. We have already in a rough way indicated some of these causes in studying the distribution of divorce and the grounds upon which it is granted. But the causes of the instability of the family so affect our whole social life and all of our institutions that they are well worth somewhat more detailed study.

(1) As the first of these causes of the increase of divorce in the United States we should put the decay of religion, particularly of the religious theory of marriage and the family. As we have already seen, no stable family life has existed anywhere in history without a religious basis, but within the last few decades religious sentiments, beliefs, and ideals have become largely dissociated from marriage and the family, and the result is that many people regard the institutions of marriage and the family as a matter of personal convenience. This decay of the religious view of the marriage bond has, however, had other antecedent causes, partly in the moral and intellectual spirit of our civilization, partly in our industrial conditions.

(2) We should put, therefore, as a second cause of the increase of divorces in this country the growing spirit of individualism. By individualism is meant here the spirit of self-assertion and self-interest, the spirit which leads a man to find his law in his own wishes, or even in his whims and caprices. Now, this growing spirit of individualism is undoubtedly more destructive of the social life than anything else. It makes unstable all institutions, and especially the family, because the family must rest upon very opposite characteristics. Our *laissez-faire* democracy, our industrial organization, and our unsocialized education have all been responsible to some extent for making the individual take his own interests and wishes as his law.

(3) Moreover, this individualism has spread within the last seventy years especially among the women of the population, and has pro-

duced a great movement, known in its moderate phases as the "Woman's Movement" and in its more radical phases as "Feminism." The woman's movement has accompanied and in part effected the emancipation of women legally, mentally, and economically. The result is that women, as a class, have become as much individualized as the men, and oftentimes are as great practical individualists.

No one would claim that the emancipation of woman, in the sense of freeing her from those things which have prevented the highest and best development of her personality, is not desirable. But this emancipation of woman has brought with it certain opportunities for going down as well as for going up. Woman's emancipation has not, in other words, meant to all classes of women, woman's elevation. On the contrary, it has been to some, if not an opportunity for license, at least an opportunity for self-assertion and selfishness not consistent with the welfare of society and particularly with the stability of the family. We may remind ourselves once more that the Roman women achieved complete emancipation, but they did not thereby better their social position. On the contrary, the emancipation of woman in Rome meant woman's degradation, and ultimately the demoralization of Roman family life. While this is not necessarily an accompaniment of woman's emancipation, still it is a real danger which threatens, and of which we can already see many evidences in modern society. As in all other emancipatory movements, the dangers of freedom are found for some individuals at least to be quite as great as the dangers of subjection.

That the woman's movement has had much to do with the growth of divorce in this country gains substantiation from the fact that many leaders of that movement, especially the more radical such as Mrs. Gilman and Miss Ellen Key, have advocated free divorce, and their inculcation of this doctrine certainly could not have been without some effect.

But the woman's movement would have perhaps failed to develop, or at least failed of widespread support, if it had not been for the economic emancipation of woman through the opening to her of

many new industrial callings and the securing for her a certain measure of economic independence. This, again, while perhaps a good thing in itself, has nevertheless facilitated the growing tendency to form unstable family relations. But obviously this economic independence of woman is the necessary and, indeed, inevitable outcome of modern industrial development.

(4) The growth of modern industrialism—that is, manufacturing industry—must, then, be regarded as one of the fundamental factors which has brought about the increase of divorce in the United States. As we have already noticed, the growth of manufacturing industry has opened a large number of new economic callings to woman and has rendered her largely economically independent of family relations. Moreover, the labor of women in factories has tended to disrupt the home, particularly in the case of married women, as we have already seen. For the laboring classes it has tended to make the home only a lodging place, with little or no development of a true family life. Again, such labor has set the sexes in competition with each other, has tended to reduce their sexual differences and to stimulate immensely their individualism. Finally, inasmuch as modern industrialism has tended to destroy the home, the result has been the production of unsocialized children, and especially of those who had no tradition of a family life. Girls, for example, through industrialism, have failed to learn the domestic arts, failed to have any training in homemaking, and therefore when they came to the position of wife and mother, they were frequently not fitted for such a life, and through their lack of adjustment rendered the homes which they formed unstable.

(5) Closely connected with the growth of modern industrialism is the growth of modern cities, and, as we have already seen, divorce is usually much more common in the cities than in the rural districts. The growth of the cities, in other words, has been a cause of the increase of divorce. City populations, on account of the economic conditions under which they live, are peculiarly homeless. A normal home can scarcely exist in the slums and in some of the tenement

districts of our cities. Again, in the city there is perhaps more vice and other immorality, less control of the individual by public opinion, and more opportunity, on account of close living together and high standards of living, for friction, both within and without the domestic circle.

(6) The higher standards of living and comfort which have come with the growth of our industrial civilization, especially of our cities, must also be set down as a cause of increasing instability of the family. High standards of living are, of course, desirable if they can be realized, that is, if they are reasonable. But many elements of our population have standards of living and comfort which they find are practically impossible to realize with the income which they have. Many classes, in other words, are unable to meet the social demands which they suppose they must meet in order to maintain a home. To found and maintain a home, therefore, with these rising standards of living, and also frequently with rising costs of living, requires such a large income that a constantly decreasing proportion of the population are able to do this satisfactorily. From this cause, undoubtedly, a great deal of domestic misery and unhappiness results, which finally shows itself in desertion or in the divorce court.

It is evident that higher standards of taste and higher standards of morality may also operate under certain circumstances to render the family life unstable in a similar way.

(7) Another cause of the increase of divorce in the United States is the popularization of law which has accompanied the growth of democratic institutions. Law was once the prerogative of special classes, and courts were rarely appealed to except by the noble or wealthy classes; but with the growth of democratic institutions there has been a great spread of legal education, especially through the modern newspaper, and consequently a greater participation in the remedies offered by the courts for all sorts of wrongs, real or imagined. Many people, for example, who would not have thought of divorce two generations ago, now know how divorce may be secured and are ready to secure it. However, it would seem as if this cause of the in-

crease of divorce might have operated to a greater extent forty-five or fifty years ago than it has during the last four decades, for it cannot be said that recently there has been much increase of legal education among the masses, or much greater popularization of the law.

(8) Increasing laxity of the laws regarding divorce and increasing laxity in the administration of the laws has certainly been a cause of increasing divorce in the United States, though back of these causes doubtless lie all the other causes just mentioned, and also increasing laxity in public opinion regarding marriage and divorce. To assume that laxity of the laws and of legal administration has no influence upon the increase of divorce in a population is to go contrary to all human experience. The people of Canada and of England, for example, are not very different from ourselves in culture and in institutions, yet there is little divorce in England and in Canada as compared with the United States. Unquestionably the main cause of this great difference is to be found in the difference of their laws. This is not saying, however, that instability of the family does not characterize Canada and England as well as the United States, even though such instability does not express itself in the divorce courts.

Interesting statistics have been collected in numerous places in our country to show the laxity of the administration of the divorce laws. In many of the divorce courts of our large cities, for example, it has repeatedly been shown that the average time occupied by the court in granting a divorce is not more than fifteen minutes. In other words, divorce cases are frequently rushed through our divorce courts without solemnity, without adequate investigation, with every opportunity for collusion between the parties, so as to favor a very free granting of divorces. On the other hand, about one fourth of all the applications for divorce which come to trial are refused by the courts, showing that the courts are not so lax in all cases as they are sometimes pictured to be.

Moreover, the divorce courts have two excuses for their laxity. First, the divorce courts are always greatly overburdened with the number of cases before them; and, secondly, public opinion, which the

courts as well as other phases of our government largely reflect, favors this laxity. This is shown by the fact that public opinion stands back of the lax divorce statutes of many states, all efforts to make radical changes in these statutes having failed in recent years.

(9) The disintegration of the family in Western civilization is due to causes deeper than any which have thus far been discussed. So far as they can be summed up in a single sentence, it is due to the increasingly sensate character of our civilization; that is, increasing tendency to find the values of life in sense satisfactions. In other words, the values and standards of Western civilization for nearly a century have become more and more materialistic. This leads to increasing instability in family relations; because when the values of life are chiefly in sense satisfactions, there is apt to be more conflict between individuals. Careful study has shown that if the whole of civilization takes on a sensate character, more and more conflicts between individuals and groups are the result. If that is so regarding civilization as a whole, it must be so regarding the relations between individuals in the family. Such materialistic standards cause conflicts not only between husband and wife but also between parents and children. A family life on a more idealistic basis, exalting such intangibles as good will, love, justice, and mutual sacrifice, is much more apt to remain stable. However, the trend in our civilization for nearly a century has been away from idealism and toward a crude realism which recognizes but little place for faith, hope, and love in human relations.

(10) Our study of the family has accustomed us to the thought that the family is an institution which, like all other human institutions, undergoes constant changes. Now at periods of change in any institution, periods of transition from one type to another, there is apt to be a period of confusion. The old type of institution is never replaced at once by a new type of institution ready-made and adjusted to the social life, but only gradually does the new institution emerge from the elements of the old. In the meantime, however, there may be a considerable period of confusion and anarchy. This social princi-

ple, it should be noted, rests upon the deeper psychological principle that old habits are usually not replaced by new habits without an intervening period of confusion and uncertainty. In other words, in the transition from the old habit to the new habit there is much opportunity for disorganization and disintegration. It is exactly so in human society, because social institutions are but expressions of habit.

Now, the old semipatriarchal type of the family, which prevailed down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the type of the family which might perhaps properly be called the monarchical type, has been disappearing for the past one hundred years,—is in fact already practically extinct, at least in America, but we have not yet built up a new type of the family to take its place. The old semipatriarchal family of our forefathers has gone, but no new type of the family has yet become general. A democratic type of the family in harmony with our democratic civilization must be evolved. But *such a democratic type of the family can be stable only upon the condition that its stability is within itself and not without.* Authority in various coercive forms made the old type of the family stable, but a stable basis for a new type of the family has not yet been found, or rather it has not been found by large elements of our population. Unquestionably a democratic ethical type of the family in which the rights of every one are respected and all members are bound together, not through fear or through force of authority, but through love and affection, is being evolved in certain classes of our society. The problem before our civilization is whether such a democratic ethical type of the family can become generalized and offer a stable family life to our whole population. It is evident that in order to do this there must be not only a considerable development of the spirit of equality but, even more, a considerable development of social intelligence and ethical character in the minds of the people. To construct a stable family life of this character, however,—which is apparently the only type that will meet the demands of modern civilization,—is not an impossibility, but is a delicate and difficult task which will require all the

resources of the state, the school, and the church. There is, however, no ground as yet for pessimism regarding the future of our family life; rather all its instability and demoralization of the present are simply incident, we must believe, to the achievement of a higher type of the family than the world has yet seen. Such a higher type, however, will not come about without thought and effort or without wise social leadership.

The Reconstruction of the Family.—That instability of the family—with divorce, so far as it is an expression of that instability—is an evil in society is implied in all that has thus far been said concerning the origin, development, and functions of the family as an institution. While all the preceding chapters amount to an argument on this question, a word further may not be out of place. It is often said by those who favor free divorce, that such divorce will prevent immorality in society; but it must be pointed out that this has not been the experience in other countries and ages than our own. As we have already seen, in proportion as divorce grew in Rome, for example, sexual immorality of all sorts increased. Weak family ties seem to encourage lax relations between the sexes generally, and to destroy the social ideal of the sanctity of the marriage bond. Again, those who advocate free divorce claim that such free divorce is for the benefit of the children as well as of the husband and wife. While it may be admitted that in many cases it is desirable to dissolve the family bonds for the sake of the children, still all investigations seem to show that the instability of the family is itself one of the greatest sources of child delinquency and dependency in those communities where such instability is pronounced.

In an investigation made by the writer in the year 1909, it was found that out of 7575 children in thirty-four State Reform Schools, 29.6 per cent came from families in which there had been divorce or desertion, 33 per cent in which either father or mother was dead, while 38 per cent (including a few cases which overlapped the first two classes) came from homes demoralized by drink, vice, or crime. In only a negligible per cent of the cases did these Reform School

children have a normal family life. Out of 4278 children investigated in four juvenile courts, it was found that 23.7 per cent of this number came from families in which father and mother were separated by desertion or divorce, while 27.8 per cent came from families in which one or both parents were dead. Even in thirty-two institutions for dependent children it was found that 24.7 per cent of the inmates were from homes in which there had been desertion or divorce, while only 47.5 per cent were either orphans or half orphans. Many similar statistics have been collected by social workers later, showing that the children of separated or divorced parents are much more apt to drift into poverty, vice, or crime, that is, into the unsocialized classes, than children who do not come from such disrupted homes.

The general conclusion of social workers is that a normal family life in which the child has the care of both parents is the best possible guarantee for the proper adjustment of the child to society; for hitherto all experiments in the proper care and upbringing of children in institutions have been, comparatively speaking, failures. We are not warranted, therefore, in drawing any other conclusion than that the welfare of the child as well as the moral character of adults is bound up with the stability of the family.

If the real evil is not divorce, but the decay of the family life, however, it is idle to suppose that superficial remedies will suffice. Nothing short of radical social reconstruction, such as will put an end to all of the disintegrating influences which are now affecting the home, whether industrial, political, or moral, will solve the problem of the modern family. The problem of the family, in other words, like all other social problems, is bound up with the total conditions of modern social life. As has often been emphasized, present social problems are all interdependent and really but phases of one larger problem, the "Social Problem," the problem of the relations of men to one another.

Legislation can do little, in one sense, to correct the real evil. That it can do nothing, and that an attitude of *laissez-faire* is justified upon this question, is, of course, not true. Legislation, if properly applied, can assist in accomplishing much. Even direct legislation regarding

marriage and divorce can accomplish something. As we have already noted, the difference between the few divorces of Canada and England, and the many divorces of the United States, is largely due to a difference of laws. But of course we must not assume that there is a like difference in the state of the family life of the two countries. Legislation, in other words, may simply ignore social evils, and prohibit in appearance things which persist in reality. While it is not too much to say that the divorce laws of many of our states are a crime against civilization, because they have set low moral standards, yet the making of these laws stricter may not of itself greatly check the decay of the family. Let us note, however, some of the proposed reforms which seem feasible with reference to marriage and divorce, because they illustrate the difficulties and the principles of scientific social reconstruction in general.

Proposed Legislative and Judicial Remedies for the Divorce Evil. (1) The first of these which might be mentioned is a uniform divorce and marriage law, to be enacted by the Federal Congress and administered by the Federal courts. The enactment of such a law, however, would require an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Assuming that such amendment is possible, a uniform marriage and divorce law for the whole United States is certainly desirable; for such a fundamental institution as the family should not be left to the regulation of local administrative areas, such as our states are. The family is not a state concern, but a national concern. However, as has already been implied, the family problem is so deep that a mere transfer of the laws governing marriage and divorce from the statute books of the states to the statute books of the nation would make no material difference in the problem. There can be no question but that the states which now lead in divorce would continue to lead. In Switzerland, for example, where the cantons had the right to regulate divorce prior to 1876, in 1906, after thirty years of uniform law, the canton of Geneva had one divorce to every 7 marriages, while the canton of Valais had one divorce to every 250 marriages. Nevertheless, while we must not expect too great results to follow, uniform divorce and

marriage laws are important enough to be worth working for. It is possible that such uniformity may be brought about through the co-operative action of our states rather than through an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

(2) Of more importance than uniformity in divorce laws, however, is reform in judicial procedure in trying divorce cases. We have already seen that very often divorce cases are rushed through our courts, not only without solemnity, but even without adequate knowledge of the merits of the cases. This has resulted, in many instances, in divorce being granted, in effect, upon mutual consent of the parties—something never contemplated by our divorce legislation, lax though it be. Two reforms may be suggested which would undoubtedly correct the worst of these evils. The first is the appointment, in every court which tries divorce cases, of a Divorce Proctor whose duty shall be to inquire carefully into every application for divorce to see whether the alleged grounds actually exist and whether there is an absence of collusion or fraud, and then to advise the judge. In some courts the appointment of such divorce proctors has resulted in cutting down the number of divorces granted nearly thirty per cent in a single year, a conclusive proof that many divorces had previously been granted upon inadequate grounds or through collusion or fraud.

A second reform in judicial procedure in granting divorce, more radical than the first, would be to put the matter of divorce in the hands of special Courts of Domestic Relations. Such courts already exist in several cities, but hitherto their control over divorce cases has been limited. It would seem that all applications for the dissolution of family bonds, whether between husband and wife, or parents and children, should come, in the first instance, before special tribunals which should carefully investigate the cases to see whether or not the welfare of society would be served by the breaking up of the particular family. The subordinate officers of such courts could fully establish the facts and make recommendations to the judges, while the judges in turn could, in many instances, reconcile the parties and thus

preserve the unity of the family. This has been done very successfully in a large number of instances by the Courts of Domestic Relations in Chicago and other cities. Similar practices in Switzerland also have been found effective in bringing about the reconciliation of many parties seeking divorce. Such work by the courts is truly reconstructive of the family, and cannot be too highly commended. The trouble is that in a majority of cases it comes too late. As yet, moreover, such Courts of Domestic Relations exist only in very large cities; and even where they exist, they have only a limited jurisdiction in matters affecting the family.

(3) A third legislative remedy for the divorce evil would be lessening the number of legal grounds for absolute divorce. There can be no question but that such legislation is desirable in many of our states. However, such legislation might easily make the mistake of going too far, and of simply forcing the evil beneath the surface. A practicable divorce law in a majority of our states at the present time would probably have to recognize the five or six most serious grounds for divorce which have already been discussed in this chapter, and for which over ninety per cent of the divorces are granted. Stricter laws, however, in many of our states, would serve to set higher standards for the family life and indirectly might thus do considerable to lessen the instability of the family.

(4) Restrictions upon remarriage of divorced parties might also do something to reduce the instability of the family. Statistics in the United States seem to indicate that from thirty to fifty per cent of divorced persons remarry, according to the locality. While no large proportion of divorces are sought for the purpose of immediate remarriage, yet some are, and the number is apparently increasing. If restrictions upon remarriage were permanent, this would amount to making divorce merely legal separation, and might be at the present time a practice which would be socially inexpedient. On the other hand, the lax laws of some of our states which permit immediate remarriage upon divorce make possible frequent remarriage on the part of divorce "repeaters" and result in affronts to public decency. Stu-

dents of divorce, therefore, are practically unanimous in the opinion that a reasonable time should elapse after a divorce decree has been granted before remarriage is permitted. This is probably best secured by what is known as the *nisi*, or conditional, decree of divorce, which becomes absolute, permitting remarriage, only after a period of one or two years, thus allowing the divorced parties to effect reconciliation within that time without the formality of remarriage.

(5) Restrictions upon marriage are advocated by certain writers as a remedy for the instability of the family. It is said that the real evil is not the divorce evil, but the marriage evil, and that we should have very few divorces in society if we had only wise marriages. This may be granted without accepting the view that legal restrictions upon marriage would do much to make our family life more stable. Wise marriages should, of course, be in every way encouraged by society, but thus far it has been found possible to do but little in a legal way to bring about such marriages. To be sure, our marriage laws are still lax, and they should do more than they do; but at best marriage laws could act only negatively, that is, they can prevent to some extent unwise marriages, but can do very little to secure wise ones. The laws might safely forbid not only the marriage of persons of immature age, of defectives, and of those afflicted with contagious diseases, but also probably the marriage of persons of too great difference in age, or of different races. Farther than this the laws could scarcely go with safety. In all countries where property restrictions have been put upon marriage, or where the legal age of marriage has been placed too high, a great increase in illegitimacy has resulted. Indeed, the general policy of the law should undoubtedly be to encourage marriage among all normal persons in society and certainly not to make marriage difficult for such.

Conclusions Regarding the Reconstruction of the Family.—What law cannot accomplish or even safely attempt, however, education, public opinion, and social standards can. It is to the power of these rather than of mere legislation that we must look for stable and adequate reconstruction of any institution; for back of all institutions

stand the habits, opinions, and standards of the mass of individuals. The chief thing which is wrong with American family life is after all the "mores," the social standards, of the American people in regard to the family. Now, the "mores" of a people can be changed for the better only in one way—and that is through a process of *learning* on the part of the mass of the people. There are several ways, of course, in which a people may learn, but the safest and most economical way is through the systematic education of all the people in social matters. *The social education of individuals, especially of the young, is the key to the scientific reconstruction of society.* Let us consider, then, more in detail social education as a means of reconstructing our family life.

Social Education and the Reconstruction of the Family. Education, unlike legislation, can easily change the habits, opinions, and standards of individuals, because the whole process of education is essentially a process of taking on certain habits, ideas, and ideals as preparation for life. Legislation, on the other hand, is necessarily external and coercive. It affects the individual for the most part too late in life to change radically his habits or even his opinions. It is for this reason that legislation has so many shortcomings as an instrument of social reconstruction or reform. Of course, neither education nor legislation should be neglected in social reconstruction. Both are necessary and supplement each other. Wise legislation must rest upon the opinions, ideals, and habits of the people already formed through education. On the other hand no public system of education can exist unless it is supported by appropriate legislation.

In this matter of reconstructing our family life, therefore, the main reliance must be placed upon the education which the school, the church, and the home can give to the rising generation. Until children are taught to look upon the family as a socially necessary and therefore sacred institution, until they are taught to look upon marriage as something other than an act to suit their own convenience and pleasure, we must expect that our family life will be unstable. While the reconstruction of our family life practically involves the reconstruction of our whole social life, as has already been pointed out, yet

the key to the situation in any event is the social education of the young, because only through such education can right ideals concerning marriage and the family be acquired. The importance of a pure and wholesome family life should, therefore, be emphasized by our whole system of public education from beginning to end. This can readily be done even in the lowest grades through throwing the emphasis upon the importance of the home and the family in all social activities and relationships. Here, of course, would enter instruction in the domestic sciences and arts in our public schools; also education for parenthood so far as it is practicable to give such education in the public schools.

The institution in society, however, which is especially charged with the task of conserving and propagating social ideals is the church. It is evident that a large responsibility for right ideals concerning marriage and the family must rest upon the church. Unless the church teaches such ideals, other institutions in society will not teach them to any extent. So far as the Christian church is concerned, it may be suggested that the first social task of the present church should be, as it was of the primitive church, the reconstituting of a stable and pure family life.

It may be admitted, however, that the chief education along these lines must come in the home itself. Only there can the truest respect for marriage and the family be effectively inculcated in the young. Many homes, however, are already so demoralized in this respect, that we cannot expect that the children in them will receive the right ideas from their home life. Hence the importance of supplementing the moral education along these lines which has hitherto been given mainly in the home, by explicit education in our public schools and in our Sunday schools. The situation is, however, not so difficult as might seem, for we must remember that imitation in society moves from the socially superior to the socially inferior classes. Proper social leadership in this matter of educating the child adequately in the school, the church, and the home in everything which pertains to the family would insure a great improvement within a single generation.

There is no reason, then, for pessimism; but it is evident that effective work along this line has hardly yet begun.

A Normal Family Life *is one which continues, preserves, and enhances human life.* It evidently requires not only proper physical conditions, sufficient income to maintain a decent standard of living,[1] and ethical, democratic relations between its members, but, above all, consideration of the child. It is this last which marks the fully socialized family; for the welfare of the race and of society is bound up with the welfare of the child.

Child welfare may, indeed, in one sense be said to be the central problem of civilization. For this reason, the child has always been and must continue to be the center of gravity, so to speak, in any normal family life. Any discussion of the family, therefore, which fails to make the welfare of the child that is, or may be, born there the matter of the highest importance in the family life misses the whole point. On the other hand, any discussion of child welfare which fails to recognize the family as the normal environment of the child also misses the point. For so-called children's institutions, juvenile courts, and other child-saving agencies are very inadequate substitutes for a normal home. The securing of a normal family life for all classes is, then, the indispensable thing needed for child welfare; and, on the other hand, a normal family life must be centered in the child.

From this point of view the way which must be followed to secure the solution of the many problems connected with our family life becomes clear. For example, whether a particular family should be dissolved or not is a matter which should be decided upon the basis, not primarily of the happiness of husband and wife, but rather of the welfare of the children involved; and society, of course, cannot afford to set up one standard for couples with children and another standard for couples without children, as that would place a premium upon childlessness. Again, the labor of married women outside of the home,

[1]The student should review what was said in Chapter IV about the influence of industrial conditions in undermining a normal family life.

the labor of children themselves, wages and hours of breadwinners, and even the building of our cities must be regulated upon the basis of child welfare. Finally, the unsocialized individualism of our "mores" with reference to marriage and the family must be modified for the sake of the child. This last is the most needed reform of all, for the instability of the American family is rooted not so much in our industrial conditions as in our "mores," as is shown by such facts as that divorces usually increase with economic prosperity, and that American industrial development is of the same general type as that of European countries which have a more stable family life.

It may be pointed out that in emphasizing child welfare as the basis for deciding problems of the family, there is no necessary sacrifice of the moral and social welfare of adults. Any system of morality which is social in its aim must place a premium upon the development of altruism. The moral character of adults, in other words, can best be safeguarded by emphasizing the claims which society and the race have upon the individual; and the child stands, as we have seen, for society and the race, and so for the development of the higher altruism.

General Conclusions for Social Reconstruction.—The study of the problem of reconstructing our family life furnishes certain conclusions regarding social reconstruction in general which are worth emphasizing. Social reconstruction, as we have seen from the problem of reconstructing our family life, always involves reconstructing the "mores." But this cannot be accomplished by mere force or coercive legislation. It can be accomplished only by a process of educating the whole people. The press, the school, and the church must be the prime agents for accomplishing such a process of education. Free public discussion and the free formation of public opinion under the guidance of social leaders are also necessary before a definite social decision can be reached which will change social standards. Only when public opinion and public sentiment have so crystallized that social standards have already practically changed, is it wise to pass coercive laws. Even then laws must be supported by the active

forces of government, education, morality, and religion, if they are to be effective and the habits of the people definitely changed. All agencies of social control, in other words, must be enlisted. Moreover, economic conditions and conditions in the physical environment must also be so changed as to be favorable to the new standards if they are to be successful. If, on the other hand, laws are enacted without such a process of popular education and without the free formation of a public opinion, they will not represent the popular will and must sooner or later prove a failure. The same thing is evidently true if they are not actively supported by political, educational, moral, and religious agencies after enactment, and if appropriate changes in the material conditions of life are not made. In stable social reconstruction society must move as a unit; but social education is the key to its successful prosecution.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ADLER, F., *Marriage and Divorce*, Chap. II.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Reconstruction of Religion*, Chap. VII.
GILLIN, J. L., and GILLIN, J. P., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. XIV, XV.
LIGHTENBERGER, J. P., *Divorce: A Social Interpretation*, Chaps. V, X-XIII.

For more extended reading:

BABER, R. E., *Marriage and the Family*, Chaps. XII, XIV, XV, XVIII.
BALLARD, L. V., *Social Institutions*, Chaps. V, VI.
BERNARD, J., *American Family Behavior.*
BUSHEE, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chap. XVIII.
CALHOUN, A. W., *Social History of the American Family*, Vol. III.
DOUGLAS, P. H., *Wages and the Family.*
ELMER, M. C., *Family Adjustment and Social Change*, Chap. I.
FOLSOM, J. K., *The Family*, Chaps. XII, XIII.
GOODSELL, W., *Problems of the Family*, Chap. XVIII.
GROVES, E. R., *The American Family.*
GROVES, E. R., *The Family and Its Social Functions*, Chap. XXI.

GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family*, Chaps. IX-X.
GROVES, E. R., and OGBURN, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships*, Chaps. I, VIII, XXII.
HART, H. N., *The Science of Social Relations*, Chaps. XVII-XVIII.
HART, H. and ELLA B., *Personality and the Family*, Chap. X.
HOWARD, G. E., *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, Vol. III, Chap. XVIII.
MOWRER, E. R., *Domestic Discord.*
MOWRER, E. R., *The Family.*
NIMKOFF, M., *The Family*, Chaps. II, III, XI, XII.
POPENOE, P., *The Conservation of the Family.*
REUTER, E. B., and RUNNER, J. R., *The Family.*
SAIT, UNA B., *New Horizons for the Family.*
SCHMIEDELER, E., *An Introductory Study of the Family*, Part II.
SPENCER, A. G., *The Family and Its Members*, Chaps. I-XII.
SPENCER, A. G., *Women's Share in Social Culture.*
WALLER, W., *The Family, A Dynamic Interpretation.*
WILLCOX, W. F., *The Divorce Problem: A Study in Statistics.*
ZIMMERMAN, C. C., and FRAMPTON, M. E., *Family and Society.*
Special Reports on Marriage and Divorce, U. S. Census Bureau.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What great historical movements have especially affected modern family life?

2. What is the problem of the modern family?

3. Why do divorce statistics throw light upon this problem? Why especially in the United States?

4. Give the comparative divorce statistics of the United States and other countries.

5. What is the rate of increase of divorce in the United States? What is the significance of this?

6. How are divorces distributed in the U. S. among various elements and classes in our population? Why do these differences exist?

7. Why must we regard divorce as a symptom of the decay of the family?

8. Why has divorce increased in the United States? Explain fully.

9. Are some of these same causes operative in social disintegration generally? Are they also substantially the same as produced the decadence of the Roman family?

10. Why in the transition from one type of an institution to another are there always grave dangers?

11. Why is the instability of the family to be considered a social evil?

12. Why is ordinary legislation inadequate to deal with social evils? Can it, however, do something? Illustrate.

13. Discuss in detail the proposed reforms of a legislative and judicial character for remedying the divorce evil.

14. Contrast education and legislation as methods of social reconstruction. Are they necessarily opposed?

15. What sort of education and what general point of view are necessary for the reconstruction of the family? What do you think of the feministic viewpoint in this connection?

16. Are these methods of social reconstruction which have been discussed the methods of normal, progressive change in society?

17. Why must modern civilization insure the stability of the family? How do you account for its present decay and instability? Outline briefly a program of reconstruction.

For classroom discussion:

1. What new factors have brought about dynamic changes in Western civilization in the last three hundred years?

2. Why is confusion apt to characterize periods of transition?

3. Is stability in institutions (human relations) desirable?

4. Is the American family more unstable or less unstable than the divorce statistics indicate?

5. What principles should guide us in attempts at the reconstruction of the family? Do these principles apply to social reconstruction in general?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should the United States have a uniform Federal marriage and divorce law?

CHAPTER IX

THE GROWTH OF POPULATION

Mass as a Factor in Social Evolution.—Mass is a factor in the survival of a social group. Other things being equal, that group will stand the best chance of surviving which has the greatest numbers. In a large and growing population, also, competition will be keener, selection more stringent, and hence the level of efficiency will tend to rise.

"Civilization is a function of numbers and of the contact of numbers," as Professor Keller says; however, not so much because of the two facts just mentioned, as because of the fact that the larger the mass of a given group the greater can be the industrial and cultural division of labor. This means higher, more complex social co-operation and so greater progress in industry and in civilization. With the proper organization and division of labor of large numbers the mastery over nature becomes easier. For this reason the higher types of industry and of civilization have depended upon the *growth of numbers* as *one important factor*. As we pass from savagery to civilization we find population constantly increasing. Each of the lowest savage hordes has scarcely ever more than forty or fifty individuals, and not until high civilization is reached do we find nations numbering many millions. There is thus an intimate connection between numbers and a high state of civilization.

Perhaps the chief reason for this is that the human mind gets practically all of its development through contact with other minds, and hence the multiplication of mental contacts is favorable to both mental and cultural development. Provided there is relatively free intercommunication maintained between individuals, mental interstimulation can be immensely more rich, varied, and intense in a large

population than in a small one. The number and variety of ideas in circulation in a large group is greatly increased, and hence the opportunities for the selection of valuable ideas is also increased. Hence inventions of all sorts are stimulated by the increased contacts and needs of great masses of men.

On the other hand, it is obvious that population may exceed resources, and that its increase makes the social life and its problems more complex and may greatly intensify the struggle or competition between individuals and groups.

The questions which center around the growth of population, accordingly, are among the most important with which sociology has to deal. These questions are, of course, closely connected with the family life, since the growth of population in the world as a whole is dependent upon the excess of births over deaths. However, the growth of population has so long been looked upon as a national question that perhaps it will be best to study it from the standpoint of the national group. The population of modern national groups, the influences which augment and deter the growth of population, and the laws of population in general, will be what will concern us in this chapter.

Perhaps the greatest problem in connection with population is its quality. A population which has intelligence and moral character is usually able to meet successfully its problems, at least those within its numbers. This problem of the quality of population is, however, only partly a biological problem, for intelligence and character in individuals are even more a product of culture than of hereditary qualities. However, the advocates of eugenics have forcibly called attention to the vital importance of hereditary traits in populations. This must be conceded, even if we regard culture as the more important in the determination of intelligence and character. But the problem of this chapter is the growth of numbers and the factors which enter into that growth.

Population Statistics of Some Modern Nations.—The following table of statistics will show the growth of population in some of

the largest nations of the world since the beginning of the nineteenth century[1].

POPULATION OF SEVEN NATIONS FROM 1801 TO 1940

	Population 1801 (U. S. 1800)	Population 1901 (U. S. 1900)	Population 1939–1940	Annual Rate of Increase, 1930–40, per cent
Russia (Soviet)	40,000,000	97,000,000	170,467,000	0.69
United States (continental)[1]	5,308,000	75,994,000	131,669,000	0.72
Japan (proper)	26,000,000	48,000,000	72,222,000	1.30
Germany (proper)	24,000,000	51,000,000	69,662,000	0.67
Italy	17,500,000	32,475,000	44,851,000	0.91
Great Britain and Ireland	16,345,000	41,976,000	51,735,000	0.35
France	26,000,000	38,961,000	41,907,000	0.03

The table shows that while the population of nearly all these nations increased rapidly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the rate of increase has been relatively unequal. Japan is now the most rapidly increasing in population of all the great powers. If the annual rate of increase of 1930–40 should continue, which is unlikely, Russia's population in the year 2000 would be in the neighborhood of 250,000,000; Germany's population, not counting annexations, would reach 100,000,000; while France's probable population in the year 2000, if it continues to increase only at its present slow rate, would be but 42,000,000. France, indeed, now faces the possibility of depopulation, since in the four years 1935–38 there was every year an excess of deaths over births.

World wars render all forecasts of population uncertain, but it is probable that, owing to a number of causes which we shall study, the growth of population in different nations will remain unequal.

[1]In the table the populations of the United States are those of continental United States for 1800, 1900, and 1940. The populations of Russia, Germany, and Japan for 1801 and 1901 are estimates. In the 1939–1940 column the populations of Germany, France, Great Britain and Ireland, Japan, and Italy are each an official or semiofficial estimate for 1939 or for 1940; and the population of Soviet Russia is that given by the official census of January 17, 1939.

Inasmuch as the mere element of numbers is one of the large factors in the strength and efficiency of any nation, population growth is a highly important matter. It is probable that the nations that lead in population will lead in industrial and cultural development. Practical statesmanship has often overemphasized numbers, but it is a factor which cannot be neglected in sociological thinking.

The usual estimate of the present world population is about 2,000,000,000. It is reliably estimated that the population of the world has quadrupled in less than three centuries. While such a rapid rate of increase is improbable in the future, yet even a very much smaller increase will create many new problems. Many students of population estimate that the United States will have a population of 150,000,000 in the year 2000. We have already seen that Russia's population may equal 250,000,000 by that year. India already has a population of over 350,000,000, and it is probable that China's population exceeds 400,000,000. If Japan should retain its early gains in the Second World War, its territory with those annexations would have a population of over 350,000,000. The student will have no difficulty in seeing that the immense population of these great powers introduces into the world's social and political future a momentous factor whose significance we probably apprehend imperfectly. If some nations or races limit their numbers, they will evidently be at a disadvantage in the struggle for existence, other factors being equal, with nations or races which do not limit their numbers. Moreover, the unevenness of cultural attainments of the different nations makes the problem much more difficult for any practical solution. It must be faced, however, in any attempt to understand world-wide social and political conditions. Hence the need of a careful study of vital statistics of the different nations in order to understand the working of this factor.

Population and Vital Statistics.—The population statistics and vital statistics of various civilized countries show:—

(1) The population of all civilized countries, with one or two exceptions, has been increasing rapidly since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Previous to that time we have no statistics that are reliable,

but it seems probable that the population of Europe stood practically stationary during the Middle Ages and increased only slowly down to the nineteenth century; but during the nineteenth century the population of the leading industrial nations increased very rapidly. This was due primarily, without doubt, to improved economic conditions, which made it possible for a larger population to subsist within a given area. Back of these improved economic conditions, however, has been increased scientific knowledge of ways of mastering physical nature, and accompanying them has been a very greatly decreased death rate, due in part at least to the advance of medical science.

(2) This increase in population has been due, not to an increase in birth rate, but to a decreased death rate. During the nineteenth century the death rate decreased markedly in practically all civilized countries. As we have already noted, this was due primarily to improved living conditions, particularly in the food, clothing, and shelter for the masses, but it was also due in no small part to the advance in medical science, especially that branch of it known as "public sanitation." Because the death rate decreases with improved material conditions, and probably also with improved moral conditions, it is a relatively good measure of the material civilization or progress of a people. It should be noted that the death rate is measured by the number of deaths that occur annually per thousand in a given population. The death rate of the countries most advanced in sanitary science and in industrial improvement apparently tends to establish itself around fifteen per thousand annually.[1]

(3) The birth rate of civilized countries also declined markedly during the nineteenth century, especially during the latter half. On the whole, this was a good thing. The birth rate should decrease with the death rate. This leaves more energy to be used in other things; but when the birth rate falls more rapidly than the death rate or falls be-

[1]The most competent authorities in vital statistics hold that under present conditions of knowledge, the corrected death rate in a stationary population cannot go much below fifteen for any considerable length of time. Even a death rate of fifteen per thousand in a stationary population would mean an average length of life of sixty-six and two-thirds years.

yond a certain point, it is evident that the normal growth of a nation is hindered, and even its extinction may be threatened. While an excessively high birth rate is a sign of low culture on the whole, on the other hand an excessively low birth rate is a sign of physical and probably moral degeneracy in the population. When the birth rate is lower than the death rate in a given population, it is evident that the population is on the way to extinction. Such a birth rate is manifestly abnormal. In order that a birth rate be normal, therefore, it must be sufficiently above the death rate to provide for the normal growth of the population. On the whole, it seems safe to conclude that we have no better index of the vitality of a people, that is, of their capacity to survive, than the excess of births over deaths. This has sometimes been called "the vitality index." Such an excess of births over deaths is a fairly trustworthy index of the vitality of a population, because if its biological conditions are poor, no matter how high the birth rate may be, the death rate will be correspondingly high, and the excess of births over deaths, therefore, relatively low.

Vital statistics are, therefore, when sociologically interpreted, an indication of more than the mere health or even the material condition of a given population. Probably there are no social facts from which we may gather a clearer insight into the social conditions of a given population than vital statistics.

Without going into the vital statistics of modern nations in any detail, the following tables of birth rates and death rates in three leading European nations will serve to illustrate the decrease in the death rate and the birth rate among civilized people in general, the birth rate being computed the same as the death rate, that is, the number of births that occur annually per thousand in the population.

The two tables (p. 170) show, not only that birth rates and death rates have been declining among civilized peoples, but that the decline has been unequal in different peoples. In the case of England and Wales the excess of births over deaths in the decade 1900-1909 was 11.8 per thousand of the population annually; in the case of Germany, 14.5; while for France it was only 1.0. In the years just before World

DEATH RATE

	1871–1890	1900–1909	1937
England and Wales	20.3	15.8	12.4
Germany	26.0	19.5	12.9
France	22.8	19.8	15.0

BIRTH RATE

	1871–1890	1900–1909	1937
England and Wales	34.0	27.6	14.9
Germany	38.1	34.0	19.4
France	24.6	20.8	14.7

War II the excess of births over deaths in Germany was larger than in England and Wales. During the same period the excess of births over deaths in France was insignificant; and in some years (1935-1938) the number of deaths in France has actually exceeded the number of births. During World War I the birth rate of France fell nearly one half—to 10 per thousand annually.

The causes of the stationary population of France may be mainly economic, although all factors which influence the family life in any degree must also influence the birth rate. For a number of years certain economic conditions of France have not been favorable to the growth of a large population, and at the same time the law necessitating the equal division of the family's property among children has tended to encourage small families, especially in the agricultural population. Unquestionably, however, other factors of a more general social or moral nature are also at work in France as well as in all other populations that are decreasing in numbers.

It would be well for the student to note at this point that all these factors affecting birth rates and death rates among modern peoples are social, that is, are in a people's culture or in objective social conditions. They are not purely biological, as they might be in an animal group.

The census of 1940 reported a death rate for the United States, in the population taken as a whole, of 10.8, while the birth rate for the

same year was reported as 17.9. This indicated an excess of births over deaths of 7.1 per thousand of population annually, which is sufficient for reasonable population growth, if we judge by the crude birth rate and the crude death rate. However, the population growth of the future cannot be calculated from crude vital statistics. That must be calculated from what statisticians call "the net reproduction rate," which is a measure of the potential rate of increase or decrease of a population. A net reproduction rate of 100 would indicate a stationary population. For the first time in our history the census of 1940 indicated a net reproduction rate of only 96, while in 1930 it was 111. The recent vital statistics of the United States, therefore, indicate a possible decrease in population in the near future. This is not wholly a new trend and has been expected by vital statisticians for some time. Let us note some of the historical facts.

The Decrease in the Native White Stock in the United States. For a number of decades United States Census statistics seem to indicate that the native white stock in the Northern states is not keeping up its numbers. This is suggested by the decrease in size of the average family in the United States. The average size of the family in the United States in 1850 was 5.6 persons; in 1900, 4.7; in 1930, 4.1; and in 1940, 3.8. This is the average population per occupied dwelling unit, and varied from 3.2 in the Pacific states to 4.5 in North Carolina.

The vital statistics of certain New England states, such as Massachusetts and New Hampshire, show the same general trend among the native white population born of native parents. In 1920, for example, the death rate among the native-born in Massachusetts was 12.8, while the native-born had a birth rate of only 14.9. Thus among the native-born, the number of births was greater than the number of deaths by only 2.1 per thousand of their population annually. Among the foreign-born in Massachusetts in 1920, however, the birth rate was 43.4 while the death rate was 15.5. Through a number of decades the vital statistics of Massachusetts indicated that the older stock in its population was dying out and was gradually being replaced by the children and descendants of recent immigrants.

Until recently, the birth rate among the foreign-born in the United States has often been twice as high as among the native-born. In part this was due to the fact that the foreign-born population was made up largely of persons in the prime of life. But it was also due to the fact that most of the foreign-born had not adopted the practice of artificially limiting their numbers. The foreign-born now have, however, a larger number of persons of advanced age and many of the foreign-born stock have also adopted the custom of artificially limiting the size of the family. Hence, the birth rate among the foreign-born has also been falling rapidly and tends to approximate the conditions found in the older native white stock. This is probably the reason why the census of 1940 first showed a decline in the net reproduction rate of the population under the norm of 100.

The vital statistics in the whole Northern tier of states show everywhere practically the same tendencies; everywhere we find the older native-born white population failing to hold its own alongside the recent immigrant stock. We must conclude that the birth rate of the older white stock in the United States is declining to such an extent that that element will contribute less and less to our general population in the future. Only the Southern whites present an exception to this generalization. The Southern white people, from various causes not well understood,—doubtless mainly because a large majority still live under rural conditions, partly from a lower standard of living, and perhaps partly from family pride,—keep up their numbers, increasing more rapidly than the Negro population which exists alongside of them.

Causes of the Decrease in Birth Rate of the Native White Stock in the United States.—What, then, are the causes of this decrease in the birth rate of the native white stock in the United States? It is worth while to inquire briefly into these causes, for they illustrate the factors which are at work in favoring or deterring the growth of population. They are not only of special interest to us as affecting conditions in our own country, but they are typical of the influences which determine the survival or extinction of peoples.

(1) Economic conditions are probably at the bottom of the decreasing birth rate in the native white American population. Certain unfavorable economic conditions have developed in this country of recent years for this particular element; especially have higher standards of living increased among the native white population in the United States more rapidly than their income. This has led to later marriages and smaller families. Again, more intense competition along all lines has forced certain elements of the native stock into occupations where wages are low in comparison with the standard of living. It has often been said that this has come about through the increased competition which certain foreign-born have offered to the native white element. The foreign-born have, at any rate, taken rapidly all the places which might be filled by unskilled labor and many of the places filled by skilled labor. The native stock have shrunk from this competition, and have retired for the most part to the more socially honored occupations, such as clerkships in business, the professions, and the like. In many of these occupations, however, as we have already seen, the wages are low as compared with the standards of living maintained by that particular occupational class; hence, as we have already seen, later marriages and fewer children. Rising standards of living and rising costs of living have, therefore, impinged more heavily upon the native stock than upon the foreign-born. It is difficult to suggest a remedy for this condition of affairs. No legislator can devise means of encouraging a class to have large families when by so doing that class would necessarily have to sacrifice some of its standards of living. However, it may be that the native stock can be protected to some extent from competition through reasonable restrictions upon immigration, and it may also be that unreasonable advances in standards of living may be checked, but both of these propositions seem to be of somewhat doubtful nature, because so many other factors enter in.

(2) No doubt the pressure of economic conditions is not responsible for small families in some elements of the native white population in the United States, for oftentimes the smallest families are found among the wealthy, among whom there could be no danger of a large family

lowering the standards of living or pressing upon other economic needs. We must accept as a second factor in the situation, therefore, the inherent selfishness in human nature which is not willing to be burdened with the care of children. In other countries, and apparently in all ages, the wealthy have been characterized by smaller families than the poor. It might reasonably be argued that these materialistic standards of the wealthy, diffused to the middle classes, have been the main factor in lessening the birth rate of the latter. Indeed, the spread of these standards has usually been prior to the pressure of economic conditions. The following table from Bertillon,[1] showing the number of births per thousand women between fifteen and fifty years of age in Paris, Berlin, and London among the various economic classes, shows that it is not altogether the pressure of economic wants which leads to the limiting of a population:

BIRTHS PER THOUSAND WOMEN PER ANNUM

	Paris	Berlin	London
Very poor	108	157	147
Poor	95	129	140
Comfortable	72	114	107
Rich	53	63	87
Very rich	34	47	63

(3) Besides economic conditions and individual selfishness we must unfortunately add another cause of decreasing birth rate in our population which has been definitely ascertained, and that is vice. Vice cuts the birth rate chiefly through the diseases which accompany it. About 20 per cent of American marriages are childless, and medical authorities state that in one half of these childless marriages the barrenness is due to venereal diseases. All authorities in medical sociology agree that a large per cent of the young men of the United States become addicted to sex vice before marriage. This serves to disseminate venereal diseases among the general population, especially among innocent women and children. The consequence is, on the one hand, a

[1]Quoted by Newsholme, *Vital Statistics*, p. 75.

considerable number of sterile marriages and on the other hand a high infant mortality. It need not be assumed that vice is more prevalent today than in previous generations, but on account of the conditions of our social life diseases which accompany vice are now more widely disseminated than they have been at any time in our previous history; therefore, even the physical results of vice are different today from what they were a generation or more ago.

(4) Education has been alleged as a cause of decreasing birth rate in the native white American stock. This, however, is true only in a very qualified sense. While it is a fact, as collected statistics have shown, that if Harvard and other universities depended on children of their alumni for students their attendance would actually decrease in numbers, it is not true that college graduates have had a lower birth rate than the economic and social classes to which they belong. So far as statistics have been collected, indeed, they seem to indicate that the wealthy uneducated are producing fewer children than the educated classes who are grouped with them. The influence decreasing the birth rate among the educated is, therefore, not education itself, but the high standards of living and the luxury of the classes in which they are grouped.

On the other hand, the higher education of women seems to be, down to the present time, operating as a distinct influence to lessen the birth rate among the educated classes for the reason that apparently a majority of educated women do not marry. The higher education has not yet gone far enough, however, to give us any definite facts with which to judge what the ultimate effect of women's higher education will be. If the higher education of women is going to lead to a large per cent of the best and most intellectual women in society leading lives of celibacy, then, of course, ultimately the higher education of women will be disastrous to the race. But probably the relative infrequency of marriage among women who are college graduates is a transitory phenomenon due to the fact that neither women nor men are as yet adjusted to the higher education of women.

(5) Some phases of the "woman's movement" have without doubt tended to lessen the birth rate in certain sections of American society. Some of the leaders of the woman's movement have advocated, for example, that women should choose a single life, while others have advocated that families should not have more than two children. Some "birth-control" advocates have gone so far as to claim that if families would have but two children this would be a cure-all for many social troubles. Indeed, this ideal of two children in the family has been so widely disseminated in this country that it is often spoken of as the "American Idea." Of course, such teachings could not be without some effect. Without attempting to reply to the advocates of this theory of but two children to a family, it will be sufficient to note that for a population simply to remain stationary three children at least must be born to each family on the average; otherwise, if only two children are born, as one of the children in many cases will never marry, the population will actually decrease in numbers. Under the best modern conditions one out of three children now born either fails to live to maturity or fails for other reasons to reproduce. There must be, therefore, more than three children born to the average family for a population to grow. From the sociological point of view the ideal family would seem to be one in which from three to six children are born.

(6) Finally, not all of the childless and small families in the native American stock are due by any means to voluntary causes or involuntary causes of the kinds that have been mentioned. There are also certain other obscure physiological causes at work producing sterility in American women. The sterility of American women is greater than that in any other civilized population, even apart from the causes which have just been mentioned. Some say this is due to physical deterioration in the native white American stock, and there are other things which seem to point in that direction. It may be, however, that this deterioration is in no sense racial, but only individual, affecting certain individuals who lead a relatively unnatural life. Our American civilization puts a great strain upon certain elements of our pop-

ulation, and this strain in many cases falls even more upon the women than upon the men. The social life of the American people, in other words, is oftentimes such as to produce exhaustion and physical degeneracy, and this shows itself in the women of a population first of all in sterility. It is evident that the remedy for this cause is a more natural and more simple life on the part of all, if it is possible to bring this about.

Thus, the causes which influence the birth rate are evidently very complex. In the main they are economic and cultural among all peoples, but there is no reason to believe that economic causes act alone in determining the birth rate, nor is there any reason to believe that the psychological and biological causes may be in any way derived from the economic. But mingled with industrial conditions, operating as causes, are certain social traditions and biological factors that have to be considered as in the main independent. It is furthermore evident that the causes which lead to the decline and extinction of any population, whether civilized or uncivilized, are complex. All efforts to explain the extinction of peoples of antiquity, or the decline of modern nature peoples, such as some North American Indians and the Polynesians, through any single set of causes, must be looked at as unscientific. It can readily be shown that in all these cases the causes of the decline of the birth rate and the ultimate extinction of the stock are numerous and are not reducible to any single set of causes.

Causes which Influence the Death Rate.—Before we can fully understand the causes of the growth of a population, that is, of the surplus of births over deaths, we must understand something also about the things which influence the death rate as well as the things which influence the birth rate, because, let it be borne in mind, the growth of a given population (excluding immigration always) is due to the combined working of these two factors.

Within certain limits the death rate is more easily controlled than the birth rate. It is very difficult for society deliberately to set about to increase the birth rate, but it is comparatively easy for it to take

deliberate measures to decrease the death rate, because all individuals have a selfish interest in decreasing the death rate; but the increase of the birth rate does not appeal to the self-interest of individuals. Modern medical science, as we have seen, has done much to decrease the death rate in civilized countries, and it promises to do even more. A century ago a death rate of fifty or sixty per thousand population in urban centers was not unusual, but now the time has come when a death rate of twenty per thousand of the population is considered disgraceful to any community. As we have already seen, the normal death rate of the most enlightened European and American communities tends to establish itself around fifteen per thousand.

Of course the sanitary and hygienic conditions which influence the death rate are so numerous that they cannot be fully discussed here. But we should consider some of the more general social causes which are often overlooked and which are of particular interest in sociology.

(1) World wars have demonstrated once more that war, next after famine and pestilence, is the greatest destructive agency known to man. While previous recent European wars, such as the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871, had comparatively small effects upon the death rates of the countries involved, the reverse was true of World War I. In all the chief belligerent nations the death rate was enormously increased, while the birth rate was greatly decreased. Thus France suffered a loss of about seven per cent of its total population in the years 1914-1918, losing 1,427,000 through deaths in its military forces, and over 1,000,000 through the excess of deaths over births in its civilian population, during the four years of the war. Germany, it is estimated, suffered a total loss, within its geographical boundaries of 1914, of about 3,500,000 in its population during the four years of World War I, of which number, however, only 1,611,000 was from deaths in its military forces. It is estimated that about 10,000,000 died in the armies of the whole of Europe during the war, while almost as many more were permanently disabled—the total wounded being estimated at over 20,000,000. In addition, perhaps 10,000,000 died in Europe from the diseases and starvation caused by the war. Thus we see that even

in modern war disturbances in economic and sanitary conditions may cause more deaths than wounds received in battle.

(2) As already implied, also, economic conditions exercise a very great influence upon the death rate, especially when economic conditions cause increased cost of the necessities of life and widespread scarcity of food. This cause produces far more deaths in modern nations than any other preventable cause. The doubling of the cost of bread during the World War I was one of its greatest calamities. While in peace modern civilized peoples fear famine but little, there are many classes in the great industrial nations that live upon such a narrow margin of existence that the slightest increase in the cost of the necessities of life means practically the same as a famine to these classes. Statistics, therefore, of all modern countries, and particularly of all great cities, show an increase in sickness and death among the poorer classes in times of economic depression unless generous relief is given.

(3) Other economic causes also greatly affect the death rate, especially industrial accidents and occupational diseases. It is estimated by reliable authorities that in the United States alone 18,000 are killed annually by industrial accidents, and 1,000,000 maimed and wounded, and that there are as many as 3,000,000 cases of illness in a year produced by harmful industrial conditions. It is evident from these figures that modern industry is more bloody than many a war, and that in all industrial communities, unless there are the most advanced sanitary and safety appliances, it must swell the death rate considerably.

(4) Climate and season are rather constant factors in the death rate of all communities. The rule here is that in cold and temperate lands the death rate is higher in winter, while in warm and hot lands the death rate is higher in summer. Taking 100 as an arbitrary standard, in Sweden in February deaths rise to 113, in August they go down to 79. In the United States, however, in 1940 the death rate in January was 12.6 and in February 12.5, and in August 9.3, while the death rate for the year was 10.8. The period of minimum death rate in the United States seems to be in the summer and autumn.

(5) The biological fact of sex also influences death rate. Males in general are shorter-lived than females. This is in part due to the fact that men are more exposed to the dangers of industry in earning a livelihood, while women are more secluded in the home. But this does not explain entirely the discrepancy in the death rate of the two sexes, for boy babies die more frequently than girl babies. As we have already seen, the female organism is the more stable, biologically, and hence females, while having less physical strength, have more vitality than males. In the United States the death rate in 1940 for the males was 11.9 per thousand of the male population, while the death rate for the females was only 9.5 per thousand of their population.

(6) Conjugal condition is also a factor which affects death rate. The differences between the death rates of the married and unmarried have long been noted. The following table of the death rates (per thousand) of males and females of different conjugal classes between the ages of forty and fifty years (in Germany, 1876-1880), taken from Professor Mayo-Smith's *Statistics and Sociology*, illustrates this:

Single males.....	26.5	Single females	15.4
Married males	14.2	Married females...	11.4
Widowers.....	29.9	Widows	13.4

It will be seen from these figures that in the more advanced years of life the death rate among the single is higher than among the married. The probable explanation of this, however, is not that the married state is better physiologically, as has been so often claimed, but that it is better socially. These figures are a testimony, in other words, to the social advantages of the home. Single persons, particularly in the more advanced years of life, who are without homes, are more liable to fall sick, and when sick are less likely to receive proper care. That these figures show the great social advantage of the home in preserving life is evident from the fact that among the widowers, whose homes have been broken up, the death rate is higher even than among the single males. Moreover, in interpreting such statistics we must bear in mind that the unmarried in the higher ages of life are made up very often of those who are relatively abnormal, either physically or

mentally, that is, of those who are biologically unfit. Inasmuch as the single persons include many of this class, and also lack the comforts of home, it is not surprising that the death rate is much higher among them.

(7) Infant mortality is one of the most interesting phases of vital statistics. It has been said that the death rate is a rough measure of a people's civilization. Even more, however, the death rate among children, particularly those under one year of age, is an index to a people's sanitary and social condition. Taking the world as a whole, it is still estimated that one half of all who are born die before the age of five years. This represents an enormous waste of energy. Even in many civilized countries the death rate among children, and especially among infants under one year of age, is still comparatively high. Most of this death rate is unnecessary, could be avoided, and, as has already been noted, represents a waste of life. According to Dr. Newman,[1] during the decade 1894-1903, in Russia 27 per cent of all children born died the first year; in Germany, 19.5 per cent; in France, 15.5 per cent; in England, 15 per cent; in Norway, 9.4 per cent; in New Zealand, 9.7 per cent; and in the United States, about 16 per cent. Probably the chief factor in causing a high infant mortality is the ignorance of parents as to proper methods of child care; but this is closely correlated with economic conditions. The Federal Children's Bureau has shown that the highest death rate of children in the United States is generally in families with very low income, while the lowest death rate was found in families with an income above $1200 annually. What proper measures can do to reduce infant mortality is shown by recent statistics. Thus, in the United States in 1940 only 4.7 per cent of the children born died the first year, and in New Zealand in 1937 the per cent was only 3.2.

The Laws of the Growth of Population.—Can the growth of population be reduced to any principle or law? This is a problem which has puzzled social thinkers for a long time. Many have thought that the growth of population can be reduced to one or more relatively simple laws, but we have seen from analyzing the statistics of birth

[1] In his work on *Infant Mortality.*

rate and death rate that this is hardly probable. A formula that would cover the growth of population would have to cover all of the variable causes influencing birth rate and death rate and so entering into the excess of births over deaths. It is evident that these causes are too complex to be reduced to any such formula among modern civilized peoples. In the animal world and among uncivilized peoples, however, conditions are quite different, and the growth of population is regulated by certain very simple principles or laws. Thus it is probable that for centuries before the whites came, the Indians of North America were stationary in their population, for the reason that under their stationary condition of culture a given area could support only so many people. In conditions of savagery, and even of barbarism, therefore, the governing principle is that population will increase up to the limit of food supply, and will stop there and remain stationary until food supply increases. This is the condition which governs also the growth of the population of all animal species. But among civilized men who have attempted the control of physical nature, and to some extent even the control of human nature, many other factors enter in to influence both birth rate and death rate, and so the growth of the population.

Nevertheless, many social thinkers of the past have conceived, as has already been said, that the growth of population might be reduced to very simple and definite laws. Among the first who proposed laws governing population was an English economist, Thomas Robert Malthus, whose active career coincides with the first quarter of the nineteenth century. In 1798 Malthus put forth a little book which he entitled *An Essay on the Principle of Population as it affects the future improvement of society.* This essay went through numerous editions and revisions, and in it Malthus elaborated his famous economic theory of the growth of population. Inasmuch as this theory of Malthus has been the storm center of sociological and economic writers for more than one hundred years, it is worth our while to note very briefly what Malthus's theory was, and why it is inadequate as a scientific statement of the laws governing the growth of population.

Malthus's Theory of Population. In the first edition of his essay Malthus contended that population tends to increase in geometric ratio, while food at best will increase only in arithmetical ratio; and that this means that constant discrepancies between population and food supply would appear, with the result that population would have to be cut down to food supply. Later Malthus saw how crude this statement of his theory was and abandoned any attempt at mathematical statement, presenting substantially the following theory: (1) Population is necessarily limited by food; (2) Population always increases where food increases and tends to increase faster than food; (3) The checks that keep population down to food supply may be classified as positive and preventive. Positive checks are those which increase the death rate, such as famine, poverty, war, disease, and the like. Preventive checks are those that decrease the birth rate, such as late marriage and prudence in the birth of children. Inasmuch as Malthus believed that the positive checks would always operate where the preventive checks did not, he advocated the use of the preventive checks as the best means to remedy human misery. The inherent tendency of population to outstrip food supply, Malthus believed to be the main source of human misery in all of its forms.

Criticisms of Malthus's Theory. (1) It is evident that Malthus's theory applies only to a stationary culture, that is, a nonprogressive civilization, because in a progressive civilization human invention and, therefore, food supply, may far outstrip any increase of population. This was the case in practically all civilized countries during the nineteenth century, where improvements in machinery and agriculture greatly increased the food supply. If it be replied that this increase of food is but temporary, and that sooner or later Malthus's theory must operate, then it may be said, on the other hand, that as yet we see no limit of man's mastery over nature, and that apparently we are just entering upon the stage of material progress. We have just begun to conquer physical nature, and in the United States in particular scientific agriculture tells us that not half of the actual fertility of the soil is utilized. Malthus, of course, did not foresee the inventions and

agricultural progress of the nineteenth century. For this reason his theory was a static one and it cannot be made to apply to a progressive society.

(2) Similarly, the theory makes no allowance for the increased efficiency which may come with increased population, because increase of population may make possible better co-operation. As we have already seen, co-operation and division of labor in a society depend upon the size of the group to a certain extent; that is, the larger the group there is for organization the better can be the organization and division of labor in that group. Every increase of population, therefore, opens up new and superior ways of applying labor; and co-operation and the division of labor make it possible for men to do more as a group than they could possibly accomplish working as individuals. Improved means of co-operation, therefore, operate very much the same way in controlling nature as new mechanical inventions.

(3) The theory of Malthus makes no allowance for the general law of animal fertility, which is that as the rate of individual evolution increases the rate of reproduction decreases. Of course, Malthus's theory antedates this law of animal fertility, which was first stated by Herbert Spencer. Some scientists declare that this law does not apply within the human species. As we have already seen, however, the lower and less individualized classes in human society reproduce much more rapidly than the upper or more individualized classes. Increase of food supply, or of wealth, does not necessarily mean increase of population, and the fatal error in Malthus's theory is that he assumes that wherever food increases population always increases unless deliberate checks are applied.

(4) The overpopulation which Malthus feared, so far from being an evil, has been shown by the labors of Darwin to be the condition essential to the working of the process of natural selection in the human species. Overpopulation, at least until artificial selection arrives, is not an evil, but a good in human society. Without it there would not be sufficient elimination of the unfit in human society to prevent wholesale social degeneration. Even with artificial selection, however, some

overpopulation would be necessary for the working of any scheme of selection. We must conclude, then, that Malthus's theory, either as an explanation of the growth of modern populations or as an implied ethical doctrine, is of little value.

This is not saying, of course, that Malthus's theory does not have elements of truth in it. Undoubtedly Malthus's theory does apply to stationary, nonprogressive peoples, to savages and lower civilized in certain stages of culture, and also perhaps to certain classes in modern society who fail to participate in cultural progress. But these lower classes or elements in human society are constantly decreasing, especially in America, where the tendency to individual improvement is so marked. Again, Malthus's theory has certain elements of truth in it, so far as it depends upon the economic law of diminishing returns in agriculture, and in so far as it merely asserts that the struggle for existence in human society is, in the last analysis, a struggle for food. Finally, Malthus meant his theory chiefly as a criticism of socialistic and communistic schemes, which would equalize wealth and do away with competition in society. Unquestionably any such scheme to equalize wealth and do away with competition in society would result in the enormous increase of the lower and more brutal element of society—those that have not yet participated in cultural progress. Malthus's theory as a criticism of socialistic schemes that would do away with competition (which, however, is not an aim of genuinely scientific socialism) is unquestionably as good today as when it was written.

Population Control.—All civilized peoples have had policies which looked either directly or indirectly to the control of their numbers. Even the uncivilized peoples had practices which work in this direction. Usually these practices have been very crude, such as infanticide and abortion. As we have already noted, even the Greeks and Romans continued such practices, but they were largely discontinued in European populations after Christianity came to power. However, high birth rates were usually balanced by high death rates, and the European populations in the Middle Ages stood practically stationary.

Birth control or the artificial limitation of the size of the family first began to be practiced in France in the nineteenth century. As we have already seen, its practice in some years led to an absolute decrease in numbers in the whole population.

Moreover, the restrictions upon the birth rate were chiefly applied by the more intelligent and socially fortunate classes, thus producing what biologists have termed a "reversal of selection" in society, often to the extent, as estimated by some eugenists, that the lowest one fourth of the population in intelligence and in economic goods produces one half of the next generation.

We are probably not justified in drawing pessimistic conclusions from these facts, for it is possible that native abilities are diffused pretty evenly in all economic classes. However, all social facts point to the need of a rational population policy. Both from the standpoint of environment and of heredity, it is probable that under given conditions there is a best size for a population and even for the family. This is what is known as the doctrine of "optimum population." An optimum population, sociologically defined, is one of such size as will secure not only the survival of the group, but carry on all cultural activities in the most efficient way possible. Whether we consider the group struggle for existence, its competition with other groups, its productive capacities, or its educational facilities, there is always possible some number which is best under given circumstances. At once it becomes evident that the population problem is very complex. It cannot be understood simply in terms of biological and economic factors. It cannot be understood, therefore, if man is considered merely as an animal. That was essentially Malthus's mistake. Hence, the problem of population is a very essential one in the general problem of social welfare. It involves, of course, not only the quantity of human beings in a given social group, but even more their quality. As personal qualities, other than those furnished by normal heredity, are largely acquired through culture, they will best be considered in the discussion of such problems as immigration, race, poverty, crime, and education. All these vitally affect the population problem.

Here it is sufficient to note that this problem has always been a part of the tradition of a people. It is a people's tradition more than anything else which determines the birth rate and the size of the family. Indirectly it is traditional factors in the main which affect the death rate; that is, factors which influence a people's knowledge and behavior. The growth of population is, therefore, not beyond social control. Probably little control can be brought about by ordinary legislation, but the standard of living of a people is the most effective control that is known in the growth of population; and the standard of living always rests upon a general material and spiritual culture of a people. Both birth rates and death rates are, therefore, greatly affected by a people's culture and so within limits are subject to social control. The excessive birth rates which we find at times in human populations are an indication either of low general culture or of bad social conditions. So also are excessive death rates. Both are subject to scientific social control, probably effective in the long run only through raising the general level of culture in the whole population.

Summary and Conclusion.—Most modern economists and sociologists recognize the failure of Malthus to formulate a successful theory of population, and therefore some have attempted to form theories independent of Malthus; but it must be said that they have succeeded no better than Malthus. In its practical aspects also Malthusianism must be judged to be an inadequate doctrine. In practice Neo-Malthusian ideas have served merely as an excuse for the socially fortunate classes to restrict their birth rate. Modern eugenics makes a much closer approach to a rational population policy. According to eugenics, society needs birth release among the strong, the intelligent, and the economically fortunate, while it needs birth restriction among the weak, the unintelligent, and the economically depressed. But there are insuperable difficulties at present in the way of carrying out such a program. It may be accepted, however, as a standard upon which to base a rational reconstruction of our population policy; for Malthusianism in practice has worked the opposite and produced a "reversal of selection" in society.

As to economic influences, they are, as we have seen, powerful influences in determining the growth of population, but they are not the only ones. The factors which enter into determining the excess of births over deaths are much too complex to be lumped together and called "economic conditions." So far as the birth-rate side of the population equation is concerned, it would be more nearly correct to say that in a very broad sense the problem is psychological.

In conclusion, it is impossible to formulate any laws of population which are worthy of the name of laws as yet, and it seems probable that while we may understand clearly enough the factors which enter into the growth of population, we shall never be able to reduce these factors to a single formula or law. Social phenomena, it should be noted, are too complex to be reduced to simple formulas or laws as physical phenomena are reduced. Indeed, it is doubtful whether laws exist among social phenomena in the same sense in which they exist among physical phenomena, that is, as fixed relations among variable forces. Human society has in it another element than mechanical causation or physical necessity, namely, intelligent purposes, and this so increases the complexity of social phenomena that it is doubtful if there can be formulated any such hard and fixed laws of social phenomena as of physical phenomena. This is not saying, however, that social phenomena cannot be understood and that there are not principles which are at work with relative uniformity among them. It is only saying that the social sciences, even in their most biological or physical aspects, cannot be reduced to the same exactness as the physical sciences, though the knowledge which they offer may be in practice just as trustworthy.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Social Problem*, Chap. III.
REUTER, E. B., *Population Problems*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. IV-XI.
ROSS, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chaps. II-IV.
THOMPSON, W. S., *Population Problems*, Third Ed., Chaps. II, III, VI-IX.

For more extended reading:

BUSHEE, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chaps. XIX-XX.
CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M., *The Population Problem.*
CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M., *World Population: Past Growth and Present Trends.*
EAST, E. M., *Mankind at the Cross Roads.*
KUCZYNSKI, R. R., *The Balance of Births and Deaths*, Vol. 2.
LORIMER, F., and OSBORN, F., *Dynamics of Population.*
LORIMER, F., WINSTON, E., and KISER, L. K., *Foundations of American Population Policy.*
THOMPSON, W. S., *Danger Spots in World Population.*
THOMPSON, W. S., and WHELPTON, P. K., *Population Trends in the United States.*
WOLFE, A. B., *Readings in Social Problems*, Chaps. I, II, VI.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Show in detail the significance of numbers as a factor in social and cultural evolution.

2. What three important facts do the population and vital statistics of civilized countries show?

3. What is an abnormal death rate? An abnormal birth rate? Illustrate.

4. What is the best measure of the vitality of a people? Why?

5. What class in the United States may be said to have an abnormally low birth rate? Cite facts to prove this.

6. What are the causes of this abnormally low birth rate?

7. Are these causes industrial, moral, or biological?

8. Do they give you any insight into the causes of the decadence and extinction of nations? How?

9. Illustrate from the causes which influence death rate that different kinds of factors enter in.

10. What statements as to the importance of war as a factor in death rate can now be made?

11. If you were to write an equation expressing the growth of population as a result of the surplus of births over deaths, how would you write it?

12. Could you get any fixed relation between the variables which enter into death rates and into birth rates (a) in civilized human populations? (b) in animal populations?

13. What was Malthus's final statement of his theory of population growth?

14. Why will it not hold as a scientific theory of the growth of population in civilized human society?

15. What is its ethical value for the guidance of personal conduct and social policy?

16. What are the elements of truth in it?

17. Does this study of the growth of population show, in your opinion, that psychic factors in civilized human society disturb the working of purely physical forces? To what extent?

18. Does it show that the instincts concerned with reproduction in man may be subjected to rational control?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the relation of mass (size of group) to social evolution?

2. Why is population one of the main problems of modern nations and of their relations?

3. How is the death rate measured? The birth rate? When may they be considered abnormal? When normal?

4. Can the growth of a population be reduced to a scientific law? Is it, however, understandable?

5. Does the eugenics movement furnish a better basis for a practical population policy than Malthus's theories?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should the state provide an allowance for each child born to couples of good heredity, good health, high intelligence, and character?

CHAPTER X

THE INTERMINGLING OF PEOPLES

MAN has always been a wanderer upon the face of the earth since the earliest times. According to modern anthropology, the human species probably evolved in a relatively narrow area and peopled the earth only gradually by successive migrations to distant lands. In all ages we find more or less migratory movements of human populations. Migration constitutes, therefore, a most important social phenomenon. Some sociologists have said that the first expenditure of energy in a human group is in the search for food. The second is in reproduction, especially in the care of offspring. The third way of expending energy is in wandering. Obviously such wandering is connected both with the search for food and with the care of offspring.

Migration and the intermingling of peoples have become especially important social phenomena in the modern world. Ancient migrations were mainly in the way of the movement of whole peoples or tribes. The Huns, for example, came into Europe as a nation. Such migrations were usually for the sake of, or accompanied by, conquest. Modern migration seems to be of an altogether different character; it is usually peaceful, is more of an individual matter, and in general simply serves to redistribute the world's population. Immigration, or migration into a country, is usually considered a secondary means of increasing the population of that country, while emigration, or migration from a country, is supposed to relieve the pressure of overpopulation in a country.

The modern intermingling of peoples is a result of the development of a machine civilization. Our machine civilization has made both communication and transportation very easy and rapid. Consequently, along with the increase of population in the nineteenth century there

went the greatest intermingling of peoples which the world has known. As this intermingling took place while there was still a great variety of inharmonious cultures among the different peoples, it has vastly complicated the social and political problems of the modern world. Among many other things, it has led to the intermingling of races on a scale hitherto unknown, as will be discussed in the next chapter. Let us first consider, however, the causes of modern migration.

The Causes of Modern Migration.—The causes of human migration are, of course, universal, but the causes in modern times vary somewhat from those in ancient times. In ancient times the chief causes seem to have been: (1) lack of food; (2) lack of territory for an expanding population; (3) war. These causes have operated universally in bringing about migrations, and they still continue to operate. But in modern times we find three other causes operating very generally: (1) largely because of differences in the labor market, many now migrate to get better economic opportunities, especially for selling their labor; (2) governmental oppression in modern times has often caused extensive migration; (3) religious persecution and intolerance have in modern times been important among the causes of migration. The predominantly economic character of most recent migration, as we shall see, can hardly be disputed, but the effects of migration upon all phases of our civilization and social life are also just as indisputable. Let us see what some of these effects are.

Migration as a Factor in Social Evolution.—Migration has had most important consequences in human history. It has always been accompanied by more or less social and cultural conflicts. Strange groups have been brought into contact with one another, and the process of mutual adjustment has rarely been free from conflict. Ancient migrations, as we have seen, were accompanied by war and conquest. Modern migration from political, religious, and economic causes, while it has rarely produced war, has brought about much individual maladjustment and cultural conflicts. The process of assimilation has not proved to be an easy one, because it involves new adjustments on the part of all concerned.

Certain biological effects of migration have very generally been alleged. It has often been held by students of social history that migration exercises a selective effect in favor of the stronger, more energetic, more adventuresome types of people. Hence it is claimed that people descended from migrants are more apt to show energy and adventuresomeness in their social life. Therefore, the process of migration, it is said, has been a selective process which has had much to do with the creating of existing social types.

While these claims may have been correct for the results of migration in times when transportation was very difficult, they seem to have comparatively little basis under modern conditions when transportation has become easy. Now it is held that the reverse process has taken place and that the elements of older communities that migrate are chiefly those who have failed in social adjustment and productive efficiency in their own communities. Therefore, instead of migration exercising a selection in favor of the stronger and better elements, it may work the reverse. Migration under modern conditions, it is said, is an attempt to escape from the difficulties of life in homelands and is usually undertaken not by the socially adjusted, but by the socially maladjusted. Hence, migration may select not the best biologically, but the poorer and less successful.

An important biological effect of migration has been the amalgamation of races. This has gone on to such an extent in the world's history that anthropologists say there are no longer any pure races. The crossing of races has had profound biological effects, some of which are favorable and others unfavorable. Undoubtedly, one result has been to add to the variability, and hence to the plasticity, of human types. It is supposed by some biologists that increased variability favors the survival of higher biological types, and in this way this increased variability is supposed by many writers to have favored social progress. When the crossing has been between racial types which are not too far removed in biological constitution or in culture, this perhaps has been the case, but we have other cases in which the results of crossing seem not to have been so favorable.

Much more important than the biological effects of the intermingling of races brought about by human migrations have been the cultural effects. As a result of migration, many different peoples with many different cultures have been brought into contact with one another. In this way peoples have come to borrow much from one another by imitating the folkways, customs, and institutions of other peoples. Many sociologists have claimed that this borrowing of one people from another has been the chief means by which civilization has been diffused over the earth. Of course, borrowing may take place without migration, though it hardly takes place without some degree of social contact, and individual and group migrations have scattered cultural traits most effectively.

Walter Bagehot pointed out that migration has been a very large factor in breaking up what he called the "cake of custom." He held that social habits had been prevented from becoming too inflexible by the contact and intermingling of different peoples. Thus progress has been made possible by bringing about greater flexibility in customs and institutions.

Lester F. Ward, a pioneer American sociologist, held that from the union of two dissimilar cultures, an impetus usually results toward the development of a newer and higher type of civilization. He regarded the cultural contacts and interminglings brought about by migration as one of the main causes of social progress in modern times. There have been many historical examples when cultures not too dissimilar have amalgamated and produced a new and higher type of civilization, and it is perhaps generally true that the intermingling of peoples in the past has been a great stimulus to progress, and probably such contact and intermingling of peoples of different cultures is necessary for progress in the future. It would seem that the breaking up of tradition and custom must continue to be one of the indispensable preliminaries to progress. Hence, under normal conditions the intermingling of peoples which results from migration must be considered favorable to social progress.

Many other important sociological phenomena flow from the inter-

mingling of peoples with different social traditions and of different race. From the reactions of such peoples in intermingling we can see in the clearest possible way the working in human society of the "consciousness of kind," that is, the consciousness of physical and mental resemblance. We can also see in connection with the intermingling of peoples many of the processes of social assimilation, both through unconscious imitation and through conscious teaching and learning. The student should note that assimilation is a spiritual process, the taking up by one group of the social traditions and customs of another group either through intermingling or through intercommunication at a distance. Social assimilation goes on much more rapidly when there is actual intermingling, even though conflict at times may result. On the other hand, the student should note that amalgamation is always a biological process and refers to the crossing of races. Hence all of the phenomena of the social interaction, whether psychological or biological, often in their intensest forms, are found in connection with the intermingling of peoples.

Immigration into the United States. —The United States in the nineteenth century became the great sociological laboratory for the study of the problems which emerge from the intermingling of peoples. All other historical examples of the intermingling of peoples seem relatively of little scientific value compared to the actual phenomena which have occurred in recent American history. If it be desired to make our study of sociological principles at all concrete, we cannot do better than study the recent history of immigration into the United States.

The great economic opportunities offered by the settlement of the vast territory of the United States, together with the causes of emigration from Europe, partly political, partly religious, and partly economic, have caused a flood of immigrants, from practically all European countries, to invade the United States. Between 1820, the first year for which we have statistics on immigration to the United States, and 1940, nearly forty million immigrants sought homes, temporarily or permanently, in the United States,—over half of them coming since

1890. This is the greatest migration of which we have any record in the world's history. Up to 1840 the number of immigrants into the United States was not so very large. In 1839 the number was only sixty-eight thousand, and not until 1842 did the number of immigrants first cross the hundred thousand mark. Owing to the potato famine in Ireland during the 1840's, and to the unsuccessful revolution in Germany in 1848, the number of immigrants from Europe began greatly to increase. In the decade of the 1850's about 2,598,000 immigrants sought homes in this country. The number fell off greatly during the Civil War and did not reach the same proportions again until the 1870's. In the decade of the 1880's the volume of immigration rose to 5,246,000. Finally, during the decade 1901-1910, immigration into the United States surpassed all former records and amounted to 8,795,000.

Careful study of fluctuations in immigration into the United States in the nineteenth century shows that they are almost identical with fluctuations in foreign imports and correspond to the economic prosperity of the country. This shows conclusively the prevailingly economic character of migration in the nineteenth century. It was mostly to find a labor market on the part of the laboring populations of Europe. It roughly corresponded also to the business cycle—rising and falling about every ten or twenty years. Maximum years of immigration into the United States were 1854, 1873, 1882, and 1903. However, owing to the prosperity of the country, after 1903 immigration went on increasing until 1907. During 1905, 1906, and 1907 the United States received more immigrants than its total population at the time of the Declaration of Independence; 1907, with an immigration of about 1,285,000, proved to be the year of maximum immigration thus far. About twenty-five per cent must be deducted from immigration statistics in prosperous years to allow for immigrants returning to their own countries; and in years of economic depression and public calamity a much greater deduction must be made. In some years, indeed, the emigration from the country has exceeded the immigration into the country.

"Old" and "New" Immigration into the United States. More than thirty different nationalities have come to make up the present population of the United States, but previous to 1890 nearly all of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe. It has been claimed that as high as ninety per cent came from Teutonic and Celtic countries and were, accordingly, almost of the same racial blood as the early settlers. They came also from countries with culture and institutions similar to those brought by the earlier colonists. But after 1890 the character of immigration into the United States steadily changed, until nearly seventy per cent came from non-Teutonic countries, such as Russia, Hungary, Italy, and Greece. Immigrants from southern and eastern Europe were not great in number until after 1900. For example, Italian immigrants first began coming in numbers exceeding 100,000 only in 1900, but in 1907 285,000 immigrants were Italians. The immigration from Russia began to be considerable, if we include Poland, by 1892, but it reached more than 100,000 only in 1903 and by 1913 reached a total of 291,000.

Such facts are cited to show the change in the sources from which the United States has received immigrants. In 1907, the year of maximum immigration into the United States, the countries of northern and western Europe furnished only 17.7 per cent of our immigrants, while countries such as Hungary, Italy, Russia, Greece, Serbia, and Rumania furnished 75.5 per cent. The cheapening of transportation and the continued economic prosperity of the United States must explain to a considerable degree this shift in the sources of immigration. The shift proved to be important, because it brought the so-called immigration problem in the United States to the fore, since immigrants from southern and eastern Europe proved much more difficult of assimilation.

The Distribution of Immigrants.—The difficulties of assimilation were increased by the fact that the "new" immigration especially failed to distribute itself evenly over the United States. There was a massing of these new immigrants in some states and communities, and careful study showed that they did not distribute themselves over

the whole country. In 1907, for example, sixty-five per cent of the 1,285,000 immigrants who came that year settled in the North Atlantic states; twenty-three per cent in the North Central states; six per cent in the Western states; and only 4.5 per cent in the Southern states. The Federal censuses of 1920 and 1930 showed that the foreign-born were confined almost entirely to the Northern states. In accordance with the economic character of recent immigration, this is what would be expected. Immigrants generally did not settle in the South because of the competition which the Negro labor of the South would offer to them; and also because the South was largely agricultural, offering few opportunities for the industrial employments into which a majority of the immigrants went.

Immigrants also tended to settle largely in cities, because here again could be found the opportunities for industrial employment. The foreign-born and their children came to dominate in many of the principal cities of the North. In New York and Boston they approximated nearly three fourths of the population. In Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago they constituted over half of the population. The census of 1930 showed that only 21.7 per cent of the people of New York city were of native white stock, while of the foreign white stock 945,000 were Russian, 1,070,000 were Italian, 600,000 were German, and 613,000 were Irish. Moreover, in many of the great cities the foreign-born formed colonies in which they tended to keep their own language, customs, and traditions. Such congestion of recent immigrants in the early third of the twentieth century proved to be a very serious question in the assimilation of immigrants to the American way of life. The experience of other countries and of certain sections of the United States had shown that such colonies could persist for an indefinite time without assimilation to the general cultural pattern of the country. Hardly any question can be raised, therefore, that there are serious problems connected with the intermingling of peoples and their mutual assimilation. The *laissez-faire* view of the nineteenth century that immigrants would naturally distribute themselves through operation of economic in-

fluences in the places where they were most needed was not well borne out by the facts of the distribution of immigrants in the United States in the early part of the twentieth century.

The Distribution of Immigrants in Industry. Perhaps three fourths of the immigrants who entered the United States in the first two decades of the twentieth century belonged to the unskilled class of laborers. There were many difficulties in finding them proper employment at decent wages. The vast majority went into manufacturing, transportation, and mining, and very few into agriculture. This enabled American capitalists to develop manufacturing, transportation, and mining faster than they would otherwise have been developed, but at the same time it gave opportunity for the economic exploitation of the labor of the foreign-born. Moreover, it aggravated the difficulties of assimilation. Geographic isolation slows down assimilation; but isolation in work does so equally. It was estimated that when the United States entered the World War of 1914–18, one half of the total labor force in basic American industries was foreign-born. Many of these foreign-born had remained aliens and were citizens of enemy countries. Here again we see some of the difficulties of the free intermingling of peoples under modern social and political conditions.

However, the alien loyalties of immigrant laborers are not the main problem in the assimilation of immigrants in industry; rather the main problem is how a large element of low-grade, unskilled workers with low standards of life can be assimilated in industrial life without exploitation by unscrupulous employers and without any tendency to lower the standard of living of the laborers in a given industry. Immigrant laborers, because they have come from countries with a lower standard of living, are very apt to offer unfair competition to American laborers. The presence of a large number of immigrant laborers in any industry is, therefore, a handicap to American wage earners in their struggle to improve living conditions. This is especially so if the immigrant laborer has no family dependent upon him. While a large supply of immigrant laborers has often in the past

enabled a given industry to develop rapidly, it has been an impediment to developing better living conditions for the mass of workers. It has, moreover, perpetuated unskilled labor and the poverty of the industrial workers.

Some Other Social Effects of Immigration.—(1) *The Proportion of the Sexes.* On account of the prevailingly economic character of immigration in the nineteenth century, it disturbed greatly the proportion of the sexes, both in the homelands of the immigrants and in the new lands to which they came. For example, for a long period of years two thirds of all the immigrants who came to the United States were males. In 1907, out of a total of 1,285,349 immigrants, 929,976 were males and only 355,373 were females. This large proportion of males in our immigrants greatly affected the proportion of the sexes in the United States, giving males often an excess of over one million in our population. Even in 1940, after severe restrictive measures upon immigration had been adopted, there were 682,226 males in excess in our white population. Now it is very generally agreed that the natural proportion of the sexes, in which the two sexes are nearly equal in numbers, is necessary for most favorable social conditions. Women, in other words, are as necessary socially as are men. An excess of males is apt to produce conditions of vice and other conditions which are not conducive to social welfare. Moreover, the temporary migration of a large male laboring population, which returns sooner or later to its native land, is apt to be accompanied by even more deplorable social conditions.

(2) *Increase of Population.* Professor Francis A. Walker late in the nineteenth century pointed out that it is not certain that immigration had increased the total population of the United States, as a decrease in the natural birth rate accompanied immigration and perhaps resulted in part from it. For this reason Professor Walker held that it was doubtful that immigration had added to the population of the United States. At any rate, the population of the country was increasing just as rapidly before the large volume of immigration was received as it increased at any later time. Moreover, the Southern

states, which received practically no immigrants, increased their population as rapidly as the Northern states; that is, the increase of population among the Southern whites was equal to that of the Northern whites assisted by immigration. It is, therefore, impossible to show that immigration resulted in a great increase in population in the United States. Immigrants may have simply displaced an equal number of native-born who would have been furnished by birth rate if the immigrants had not come.

(3) *The Standard of Living.* It is probable that the standard of living of some elements in the working classes was held back by the coming of a large number of immigrants with a lower standard of living. As we have already seen, many of these immigrants settled in the slums of our larger cities, and in this way increased the slum population and lowered living standards. The illiteracy of many of the immigrants, especially of the so-called new immigration after 1890, tended in the same direction. Nearly all of the illiteracy in the Northern states after 1900 was practically confined to the foreign-born. Thus in 1930, while the native whites in New York state had only 0.5 per cent of illiterates in their population, the foreign-born population of New York state had 10.8 per cent. Statistics of illiteracy in other states and in cities showed similar results. Let us recall that in the first decade of the twentieth century about thirty per cent of the total number of immigrants received into the United States were illiterate. The presence of such a large number of illiterates, many of whom could not speak English, led to exploitation and to other practices which inevitably lowered the standard of living and the general tone of social life.

(4) *Crime and Poverty.* It is said that crime is apt to accompany migration, because the immigrant finds difficulty in securing employment and in adjusting himself to new conditions of life. However, European immigrants into the United States have not shown any exaggerated tendency to crime as compared with our native-born whites. Probably this is because the crime rate among native-born Americans has been so high. At any rate, in general, the foreign-

born in the United States at different census periods did not show any tendency to crime greatly out of proportion to their numbers in the population. In spite of difficulties of adjustment, habits of law-abidingness brought by the immigrants from the European countries seem to have prevented the development of tendencies to crime. This was not the case, however, with the children of the foreign-born. Probably because immigrants settled so largely in the slums of our cities, the children of the foreign-born appeared to have a greater tendency toward crime than either the foreign-born or the native-born. Probably the high crime rate of the children of the foreign-born is largely a product of urban life, but it has been suggested also that the children of the foreign-born lacked adequate parental control in their new American environment.

In the matter of poverty and dependency, the foreign-born have made a more unfavorable showing. In many localities the proportion of foreign-born among the dependents has been nearly twice as great as among the native-born, but statistics vary with different localities. Again, the foreign-born have contributed out of proportion to their number in the population to the inmates of hospitals for the insane. It is not surprising that we find many such statistics in the early decades of the twentieth century, as immigration was not adequately controlled and adjustments for the foreign-born were very difficult. For example, many immigrants needed at least temporary assistance after landing in the United States, as many brought little or no money with them. Thus for a number of years the amount of money brought by immigrants from Russia varied from nine to fifteen dollars per head. On account of the difficulties of economic adjustment in a new country, it is not surprising that many foreign-born became dependent, some temporarily and some permanently.

Immigration into Other Countries.—The chief countries besides the United States that have received a large number of European immigrants are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and Australia. Argentina, next to the United States, has received the most considerable immigration from Europe. From 1821 to 1936, inclusive, Argentina re-

ceived a total of 6,341,000 European immigrants, a majority of whom came from Italy and Spain. From 1820 to 1937 Brazil received a total of 4,603,000 immigrants, a majority of whom came from Italy, Portugal, and Spain. From 1821 to 1936 Canada received a total of 5,205,000 immigrants, the majority coming from Great Britain and the United States. From 1821 to 1924 Australia received a total of 2,640,000 immigrants, mainly from Great Britain. Thus it is readily seen that the total of European immigration into all other countries than the United States is considerably less than the number of immigrants received by the United States. Immigration into other countries than those mentioned has been comparatively insignificant. In recent years immigration into these countries has shown in absolute numbers an equal or greater decline than immigration into the United States. Thus in 1937 Canada had only 17,000 immigrants as against 67,000 into the United States. Argentina in 1936 received 41,000 immigrants, while Brazil received 12,700. Australia still reported in 1936 more than 60,000 immigrants, but for a long number of years, beginning even before World War I, the emigration from Australia has nearly equaled the immigration. Here it may be noted that the immigration records of the United States do not show the total number of foreign-born who come into the country, for no record is kept of Canadians or Mexicans who come otherwise than through seaports.

There is little or no statistical evidence, therefore, that the stream of European emigration will be diverted to these other countries. If modern migration is prevailingly of an economic character, there is small chance of a great number of immigrants seeking homes in these countries unless their prosperity exceeds that of the United States. If, on the other hand, prosperity is restored in the United States after World War II, the number of Europeans who seek to come to the United States will again be considerable. Thus, it is certain that international migration, and especially immigration of Europeans into the United States, is still a problem of the future. We cannot dismiss the immigration problem in the United States as simply a phase

of our past history. The question of immigration control is still a problem.

It is hardly necessary to tell the student that immigration problems in these other countries present the same general features as immigration problems in the United States. Thus, in southern Brazil during the last one hundred years a considerable number of immigrants from Germany settled and made homes. They became an important element in the population of the four southernmost states of Brazil—the states, on the whole, most prosperous in all Brazil. They now number in the neighborhood of 1,000,000, but they have not been completely assimilated in Brazilian social and political life. On the contrary, these German immigrants felt themselves superior and tended to keep their own language, their own schools and churches. While they have been an important element in Brazil and have added to the prosperity of the country, many have not become loyal Brazilians. Thus a people relatively high in culture may present difficult problems of assimilation as well as peoples low in culture. A nation, however, must maintain a good degree of unity, and so the problem of assimilation remains, no matter what the cultural status of the immigrants may be. Free and uncontrolled intermingling of peoples, therefore, presents difficulties and dangers in the present stage of world civilization in all countries.

Immigration Control.—The intermingling of peoples is the inevitable result of modern improvements in transportation and communication, along with the development of what might be roughly called a world economy. There is no rational ground, therefore, for any nation to adopt a policy of exclusion toward all immigrants. However, as we have seen, the intermingling of peoples, if uncontrolled, results in many social maladjustments. These maladjustments resulting from the uncontrolled and unguided movements of individuals and families could be greatly lessened by reasonable regulations over international migration. Ideally, this regulation should be by international agreements; but practically for a long time to come countries may have to control immigration by their own legislation.

Restrictions upon immigration should be based not upon national selfishness, but upon the principle of the good of humanity. It is the duty of every nation to develop its institutions and its national life in such a way that it will make the largest possible contribution to the good of humanity. There can be no doubt also that the good of humanity demands that every nation protect its people and its institutions from elements which may seriously threaten their stability and survival. Here then is a general ethical principle which is ample for the reasonable regulation of immigration in all countries. But this principle is so broad we must see how it applies to different phases of national life.

(1) *The Industrial Argument for the Control of Immigration.* It has been found impossible to maintain an economic system with a high standard of living for the working class without some protection of the workers from unfair competition by foreign labor. Many of the immigrants into the United States in the nineteenth century, for example, worked for such low wages that in certain lines of industry native-born workers were almost entirely eliminated. With unrestricted immigration it is impossible to protect the standard of living of the working man, to maintain a minimum wage or other policies which will improve the condition of the worker. On the other hand, American capitalists, as we have already seen, were enabled to develop American industries very rapidly, to dominate in many cases the markets of the world, and to add greatly to the wealth of the country, by a large supply of immigrant labor. Perhaps it is true that if industrial arguments are alone to be taken into consideration, the weight of the argument will be on the side of the least possible restrictions upon immigration. But industrial arguments are not the only arguments to be taken into consideration in such a vast question as the intermingling of peoples. In addition to problems of employment and of standards of living, we must take into account the effects of free immigration upon human relations, upon government, upon national culture, and even upon the biological soundness of a population.

(2) *The Social Argument.* The "consciousness of kind" is a great factor in social assimilation. It tends to draw together people of the same language, culture, and physical appearance. Hence, it results in the formation, as we have already seen, of colonies, made up of immigrants of a given country, within the country which received them. There are instances of such colonies persisting for hundreds of years. The same consciousness of kind which tends to make immigrants clannish and form colonies of their own in which their language, customs, and ideals are preserved, works at the same time to keep them distinct and separate from the rest of the people. Without efforts to assimilate immigrants and without reasonable regulations for their admission and distribution in a country, it would seem that such colonies of different peoples and nationalities would be bound to result, and in a crisis, when national unity is needed, to have very undesirable effects. In the United States the public schools have been relied upon to assimilate to American ideals and standards the children of the immigrants; but experience shows that the children of immigrants often fail to receive from the public schools the higher elements of our culture and continue to remain essentially foreign in their thought and action. Thus far, the public school is a very imperfect agency of socialization.

(3) *The Political Argument.* Hitherto democracy has been successful only in communities in which there is a good degree of mental and moral likeness among citizens, that is, in communities not too heterogeneous in their population. Some degree of rational like-mindedness seems necessary for popular self-government. Many of the immigrants into the United States, especially the more illiterate elements, have had difficulty in understanding and appreciating the working of free institutions. Politicians have often admitted them to vote before naturalization, especially in large cities. While as a rule they do not sell their votes, their votes are often under the control of a few leaders and thus they are able to hold, oftentimes, the balance of power between parties and factions.

(4) *The Biological Argument.* There are strong arguments of a

biological nature for the regulation of immigration. In the United States it has been found that the racial factor added greatly to difficulties of assimilation. We do not yet know how large a part racial heredity may play in social and political behavior. There is diversity of opinion upon this question, but perhaps the most trustworthy opinion inclines to the view that racial heredity, even between subraces of the white race, is a factor which should be taken into account. It is hard to think that the Latin temperament will express itself socially in the same ways as the Teutonic temperament. However, it must be admitted that it is very difficult to apply any test of race in the selection of immigrants. The "national origins system" which went into effect in 1929 in the United States attempts to do this.

While it may be undesirable to discriminate among immigrants on the grounds of race, it would be certainly desirable to select from all peoples those elements that would add most to the strength and vitality of our own population. This is the eugenic argument, that if biological selection counts in the life of a people, as practically all biologists agree, then the American people should exercise a eugenic selection over its immigrants to determine who shall be the parents of future Americans. This would help to insure adequate health and a sound physique among the immigrants, and so also in the population of the whole country. The biological argument would, therefore, seem to necessitate the importance of rigid selection in the matter of whom we shall admit into the country. Little has been accomplished in the way of insuring adequate health and physique among the immigrants admitted into the United States, beyond debarring the very least fit.

The Scientific Reconstruction of Immigration Policy.—As we have already seen, immigration policy should ideally be a matter of international agreement. However, until that time arrives, countries should be as scientific as possible in the control of immigrants into their own borders. The general principle which should guide all immigration regulation is that only such immigrants should be admitted as can be successfully assimilated in the life of the nation. In the

United States, for example, this might mean a law which would limit the maximum permissible annual immigration of any people to a certain per cent (say, from two to ten) of those of that nationality who have during our national history become naturalized citizens of the United States. This, of course, assumes that naturalization is a test of the possibility of assimilation. It is only a rough test, but probably better than none. The per cent to be admitted each year could moreover be fixed by a commission according to the demand for labor and according to other national circumstances.

The second scientific principle which should guide immigration legislation is that economic adjustment is fundamental for the successful assimilation of immigrants. Hence we should admit only as many immigrants as can be given employment at reasonable wages without lowering the American standard of living. Scientific control over immigration must take into account the demand for labor and other economic conditions. This could be done by a commission of experts to calculate the labor needs of the country each year in advance.

The third principle in a scientific immigration policy should be to give preference to those immigrants who come as families to make permanent homes in the United States. This means that preference should be given to families rather than to single men; and also that preference should be given to those who declare their intention to become citizens of the United States.

We have seen that certain tests of physical, mental, and moral fitness for citizenship should also be enforced. Among these tests is the literacy test, the value of which has been much debated. It has been a part of the United States immigration law since 1917. Our law provides for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants (those who cannot read in some language) who are over sixteen years of age. The ability to read and thus to participate more or less fully in the social life about one, is a necessary foundation not only for social assimilation but for effective participation in the democratic processes of modern society. Democracy means government by public opinion; but the

chief means of forming and disseminating public opinion is now the press. Hence those who cannot read can scarcely function in a democratic society. Moreover, it has been shown that the illiterate immigrant is most liable to suffer from exploitation and to adjust himself to his environment with the greatest difficulty. The literacy test provided that those fleeing from religious persecution in Europe, also purely political offenders, wives and daughters of immigrants, and certain near relatives above fifty-five years of age, are to be exempted from the test.

The immigration law of 1924 made the basis of admission to the United States the census of 1890, and provided that a quota of two per cent of the number of people living in the United States in 1890 born in a given European country might be admitted from that country each year. Children under eighteen, wives, returning immigrants, students, and some professional classes were not to be counted in the quota. These were admitted on a non-quota basis. The law also provided that after 1929 immigrants should be admitted on what was called the *national origins system.* This system limits the number of immigrants from the Old World to 150,000 a year, and provides that each country of the Old World can send such a proportion of the 150,000 as that country has already contributed to our total white population. The effect of this law is to limit greatly the number of immigrants, but it is not based wholly on scientific principles.

Principles of Assimilation: Americanization.—Perhaps a general principle of control over immigration might be formulated for the United States as follows: While we can perhaps not be too careful as to whom we admit into our national household, we cannot do too much for those to whom we allow a share in our national destinies. Hence our attitude toward the immigrant, once admitted, should be positive and helpful, not negative. But in the past the treatment accorded to immigrants has been too often one of neglect. In the United States we maintained the open-door policy with respect to European immigrants of all sorts for a long number of years. But after the immigrants arrived, we were too content to let their labor

be selfishly exploited by their employers, and to let them live and rear their children in the slums of our great cities. We lacked a fine sense of hospitality toward the immigrant and of responsibility for him and his children. Many immigrants had to submit to hardships and evils in American life equal to any which they would have experienced had they remained in their European homelands.

Since the World War of 1914–18 we have waked up to the importance of Americanization, of making the immigrant one with us in traditions, ideals, and loyalty. The problem is a complex one, and there is danger of making many mistakes. Social assimilation, the successful incorporation of new elements into a social group, can come about only through enlisting the will and the loyalty of the newcomers. It cannot be brought about through threats and compulsion. The newcomers need to have presented to them the best traditions and customs, the best ideas and habits of American life. Moreover, the ideas and habits which the immigrants bring with them should be justly evaluated. The process of assimilation should not be wholly one sided; it should be a process of give and take. Such a process leads to the comparison and appreciation of the ideas, beliefs, standards, and values of both groups. It should develop the critical-mindedness of both groups, and result in the selection of the best in the traditions and customs of both.

Certain social conditions must be observed if the process of social assimilation is to go on in this happy way:

(1) In the first place, an atmosphere of tolerance, of hospitality, must be maintained by Americans toward all immigrants admitted. If this cannot be maintained toward any certain group, it is better not to admit that group. Any attitude of unfriendliness or any attempt at coercion of any of the new elements is almost certain to create in them attitudes which will hinder their assimilation.

(2) It follows that sympathy and understanding should be cultivated between immigrants and Americans; for these mental attitudes assist greatly in a mutual adjustment of individuals.

(3) There should be frequent personal contacts between immi-

grants and Americans, so that there may be opportunity for mutual acquaintance, mutual imitation, and a free exchange of ideas. Territorial isolation interferes with such social contact and should be reduced to a minimum by the proper distribution of the immigrants. Caste and class lines observed in the case of the foreign-born are also fatal to their assimilation, and they should be carefully guarded against.

(4) Association in common work and occupations should be maintained. The division of labor may keep the new elements separate from the old and prevent the desirable personal contacts above mentioned.

(5) Linguistic isolation is not less dangerous to social assimilation than territorial isolation and isolation in work. A common language is nearly always necessary for mutual social adjustments. The English language is the vehicle of the essential traditions of Americanism. While Americans are already too much a people with a knowledge of a single language, every facility should be opened to the immigrants to learn English. The foreign-born should be taught not only to speak but to read English as soon as possible. On the other hand, it should be remembered that persons with a knowledge of several languages may make more valuable citizens on that account, and, therefore, if their mother tongue has a rich tradition of culture, immigrants should be encouraged in its preservation.

If these principles of social assimilation are true, a free democratic society in which there is substantial equality among all members in respect to legal rights and economic and educational opportunities should show the greatest power of assimilation. On the whole, the history of the United States substantiates this conclusion. This is why the American people have hitherto shown such a wonderful capacity to assimilate the greater part of their foreign immigration. When the American people have failed to assimilate their foreign-born, it is because they have departed from the conditions of successful assimilation which are stated above, or because they have admitted immigrants in larger numbers than they could assimilate.

It is obvious, of course, that the principles of assimilation which we have just considered hold for the intermingling of peoples everywhere.

Agencies for Americanization. The most efficient agencies for the Americanization of immigrants should be furnished by the Federal government in order to insure the proper distribution of immigrants, both geographically and industrially, and the best chance of employment. Federal and state bureaus should co-operate with private employers and employment agencies, carefully supervising both to see that they in no way exploit the immigrant. It should always be remembered that economic adjustment is necessary for successful social assimilation.

The proper use of the public schools for the Americanization of the immigrant and his children is the next agency to be emphasized. In every community where there are sufficient numbers of foreign-born, night schools should be opened for instruction of immigrant adults in English, in trades, and in the principles of American citizenship. The public schools should pay more attention to social and political education, particularly education into American social and political ideas, than they have hitherto done. This is needed not only for the foreign-born and their children but also for the children of American parents.

Finally, the aid of many private agencies should be enlisted in the education and the general social and economic adjustment of immigrants. The Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., churches, and philanthropic agencies should all have special machinery to help the foreign-born. In some ways these private agencies can do much more for social assimilation than public schools or government bureaus. Obviously, they come into more vital personal contact with the persons whom they help, and the service which they render is more efficient because it is voluntary. Moreover, such service helps to overcome the indifference of the American-born toward the assimilation of the immigrant. We should not forget that the key to the assimilation of the immigrant is largely in the social attitudes of the American people. We must be willing to give those whom we receive into our national

household equal opportunity with ourselves, and to receive them on a footing of equality.

Asiatic Immigration.—When we come to the question of Asiatic immigrants settling in countries occupied by people of European stock, we no longer have simply the question of the intermingling of peoples. We have come to the larger problem of the intermingling of races. The importance of the racial factor becomes so great in the immigration of practically all Asiatic peoples that a different policy toward Asiatic immigration, especially the immigration of Asiatic laborers, would seem justified.

It is true that few Asiatic immigrants have come to the United States, or for that matter to other countries of the Western Hemisphere; but this is because the policy of exclusion of Asiatic immigrants was adopted by the United States in the nineteenth century. There is reason to believe that if such a policy of exclusion had not been adopted a very considerable proportion of our total population would now be Asiatic. Between 1851 and 1900 the Chinese sent us a total of 310,000 immigrants; and in 1882, the year the first Chinese exclusion law was enacted, there were about 130,000 Chinese in the United States. With the cessation of Chinese immigration, however, Japanese immigration began and, later, Filipino and Hindu migration. In 1940 there were only 77,000 Chinese in continental United States, most of them massed chiefly in the Pacific Coast states, 39,000 living in California. The Japanese in continental United States in 1940 numbered about 127,000, most of them also massed in Pacific Coast states, about 94,000 living in California. Besides the Japanese in continental United States, there were about 150,000 living in Hawaii.

The difficulties of assimilating these Asiatic immigrants have proved to be even greater than the assimilation of any European peoples. The opinion of the people of the Pacific Coast regarding this problem has often been discounted by other parts of the United States. But the student should remember that the opinion of people nearest a practical problem should always be respected. There are, of course, probabilities of error on the part of persons who stand very

close to social problems; but there are also probabilities of error on the part of the distant observer of conditions. It is well for us to allow a certain amount of weight to the numerous objections to the immigration of Asiatic laborers which have been made by the people of the Pacific Coast. The student will not fail to note that these objections are similar to the arguments which have been made for the control of immigration in general.

(1) Asiatic laborers frequently work for wages below the minimum necessary for maintaining the American standard of living and so crowd out the white working man. The competition which they offer along many economic lines is often unfair to the white population. Thus, for example, when the Japanese in the 1920's had only two per cent of the population of California, they produced twelve per cent of its agricultural products, as the Japanese farmers worked longer hours than the white farmers, and perhaps were more skilled in their labor.

(2) Asiatic immigrants do not readily assimilate. They represent old and proud civilizations with firmly established traditions and customs. They tend to keep their language, religion, and customs, and live largely by themselves. They are often more completely isolated from American social life than the Negro, because of their completely different culture. Many of them also keep citizenship in the Asiatic countries from which they come.

(3) Asiatic immigrants differ so much from us racially that there is danger of racial antagonism and conflicts. This is probably the weightiest argument for the general exclusion of Asiatic laborers from this country. It is certain that, should we open our doors to the mass of Asiatic laborers, we would develop racial problems upon our Pacific Coast, equal to or worse than the Negro problem in the South. We are not yet civilized enough to undertake the work of civilizing and Christianizing any very considerable number of people alien to ourselves in race as well as in culture. We shall see in the next chapter that the element of racial heredity cannot be discounted altogether in social problems.

Summary.—The control of European and Asiatic immigration is still one of the most difficult problems before the American people. Until some international agreement is reached, probably the best control can be accomplished by a general law which will apply to all nations alike, limiting the maximum permissible annual immigration from any people to a certain per cent of those of that nationality in the United States who have already become naturalized citizens. Such a law would make no explicit discrimination against Asiatic peoples, and unlike the law of 1924, which arbitrarily excluded all Asiatic laborers, probably would not offend the governments of Asiatic countries. While the attitude of extremists is to be deplored, it would seem that a policy of practical exclusion of Asiatic laborers would be best, not only for the United States, but for the whole world in the long run. We cannot hope to aid in maintaining the peace of the world by permitting conditions which will lead to racial conflicts upon our Pacific Coast.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

OGBURN, W. F., and NIMKOFF, M. F., *Sociology*, Chap. XV.
REUTER, E. B., *Population Problems*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. XII, XIX.
SMITH, W. C., *Americans in the Making*, Chaps. I-III.

For more extended reading:

ABBOTT, E., *Immigration: Select Documents.*
ABBOTT, E., *The Immigrant and the Community.*
BOGARDUS, E. S., *Essentials of Americanization.*
BROWN, F. J., and ROUCEK, J. S., *Our Racial and National Minorities.*
BUSHEE, F. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chap. XXI.
COMMONS, J. R., *Races and Immigrants in America.*
DAVIE, M. R., *World Immigration.*
FAIRCHILD, H. P., *Immigration*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. XVIII-XX.
HOURWICH, I. A., *Immigration and Labor.*
JENKS, J. W., and LAUCK, W. J., *The Immigration Problem*, Sixth Ed., Chaps. I-IV.

MAYO-SMITH, R., *Emigration and Immigration.*
PARK, R. E., MILLER, H. A., *Old World Traits Transplanted.*
ROSS, E. A., *Social Psychology*, Chaps. XII-XIII.
ROSS, E. A., *The Old World in the New*, Chaps. IX-XI.
SCHRIEKE, B., *Alien Americans*, Chaps. I-IV.
TAFT, DONALD R., *Human Migration.*
WARNE, F. J., *The Tide of Immigration*, Chaps. XXVII-XXIX.
YOUNG, D., *American Minority Peoples.*
Report of the Immigration Commission, 42 vols.
The Annual Reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration.

On Asiatic Immigration:

COOLIDGE, M. R., *Chinese Immigration.*
GULICK, S., *The American-Japanese Problem.*
MILLIS, H. A., *The Japanese Problem in the United States.*
STRONG, E. K., *The Second Generation Japanese Problem.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why does migration in both past and present constitute "a most important social phenomenon"?

2. In what ways does modern migration differ from ancient migration? What does this show about the present condition of the world?

3. What two biological effects has migration had upon peoples? What two cultural effects?

4. Why does the United States present the best laboratory for the study of the social phenomena attending migration?

5. Assuming that the problem of foreign immigration into a country is mainly a problem of social assimilation, what is the significance of the changed character of our European immigration?

6. Assuming complete assimilation of the immigrant to be desirable, what are the evils of the present geographical distribution of our immigrants? Illustrate fully.

7. What are the evils of their distribution in industry? Illustrate.

8. Mention some general social effects of past European immigration upon the United States. How far are these evil?

9. Is it probable that European immigration into the United States if unregulated would soon be greater than ever? Why?

10. Upon what ethical ground must a rational immigration policy be based?

11. What are the arguments for a careful selection of, and reasonable restrictions upon, European immigrants? Elaborate each.

12. Would immigration, if unregulated, have a different effect now than a generation ago? Why?

13. Do you regard literacy as an important test for the admission of adult male immigrants under 50 years? Why? Or why not?

14. What other tests should be imposed? Why? Outline a scientific immigration law.

15. What positive measures should be taken to aid in the Americanization of the immigrants admitted? What principles of social assimilation must be observed?

16. Can you show that the immigration problem cannot be understood without understanding the importance in the social life of the following elements: (1) like-mindedness; (2) consciousness of kind; (3) language and free intercommunication; (4) suggestion and imitation?

17. Should our policy in dealing with Asiatic immigrants be different in principle from our policy in dealing with European? If so, why?

For classroom discussion:

1. What are the biological effects of the intermingling of peoples? the cultural effects?

2. Why has the United States furnished the greatest example of the intermingling of peoples? Explain.

3. Was unrestricted immigration in the past a benefit to the United States? to the world?

4. What about migration to other countries than the United States?

5. What sociological principles should be observed in social assimilation (Americanization)?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Is the regulation of international immigration by international agreement practicable and desirable?

CHAPTER XI

THE INTERMINGLING OF RACES

IN OUR study of the intermingling of peoples we have come to race problems—problems of the relations of races to one another, and of their social adjustment. The Negro problem is one of many race problems which the United States has, but because it is the most pressing of all of our race problems it is frequently spoken of as *the race problem*, and we shall study it now as an important example of the problems connected with the intermingling of races. An unsolved element in all race problems is the influence of the factor of racial heredity. This factor is frequently ignored by writers upon race problems, but as it is the basic biological factor we must seek to understand and estimate it at the very outset of any scientific study of race intermingling.

Racial Heredity as a Factor in Social Evolution.—We have already seen that racial heredity is the least-known factor in the intermingling of peoples. While there is still much disagreement among scientific men as to the importance of racial heredity in human social behavior, the weight of opinion inclines to the view that racial heredity is a factor which cannot be left altogether out of account in studying social problems. The view of Buckle that racial heredity counts for nothing in explaining the social life of various peoples is not upheld by modern biologists. On the contrary, the biological view would emphasize the importance of species and racial heredity in all problems connected with life; thus no biologist denies that between different species of animals heredity accounts very largely for their manner of life and behavior. But man no longer lives a purely animal life, and thus racial heredity as a factor in his social life may be easily exaggerated.

The student should note that race is a biological term and has reference solely to hereditary biological traits; that racial heredity is a purely biological process concerning the transmission of bodily traits through the germ cells. "Race" is merely a collective name for the inherent biological traits peculiar to a large group.

But civilization is a complex of *acquired* habits, and acquired habits or customs are the basis of man's social life. They cannot go through the germ cells. If the racial germ plasm affects acquired habits and customs, it can only be through furnishing a constitutional bias in some given direction. Hence the appeal to racial heredity to explain human social behavior should be used *only as a last resort.* Nevertheless, since it is certain that heredity affects the conduct of each individual, so must racial heredity affect the behavior of the members of a race. If we recognize heredity as a factor in behavior, so must we recognize race. No such thing as biological uniformity exists even among individuals of the same race, and hence their responses to stimuli will vary according to their hereditary peculiarities as well as according to their habits. Even more is there biological diversity among the human races; for each of the great human races was specialized in a different geographical area under peculiar conditions of life.

Possible Social Effects of Racial Heredity. There can be no doubt that the different races of mankind have been biologically specialized in different environments. To some extent, therefore, the human races are the result of divergent organic development. Their differences in physical appearance make this clearly evident. But when the biological differences between races are studied carefully, they are found to consist merely in certain *quantitative* variations. All the races are human, and science finds no *qualitative* differences between them. Nevertheless, quantitative differences may affect social behavior in important ways. Three ways at least should be noted:

(1) The strength of hereditary, or instinctive, reactions may vary considerably in the different races and give to each race a peculiar temperament or hereditary disposition. Thus far it has not been pos-

sible for psychologists to measure the differences of temperament in different races; but it is obvious that such differences of temperament, or inborn disposition, would color the feelings, ideas, and modes of conduct of the different races. Probably the main mental differences between the human races are differences of temperament.

(2) The differences in the elementary intellectual functions such as perception, memory, imagination, and reasoning have been found to be insignificant in the human races. They vary in individuals, but thus far the fundamental intellectual functions have been found in about the same degree in all races. However, intelligence tests in the United States, especially those among the conscripts of the World War of 1914–18, were alleged to show that the Negro is slightly inferior to the white race in his ability to learn; but these intelligence tests have been called in question, as it has been impossible to isolate the hereditary element, that is, original native intelligence, from what has been learned. This is shown by the fact that both white and colored conscripts who came from states with superior educational systems tested higher. Consequently, the results of intelligence testing at the present time are in controversy, at least so far as inborn capacity to learn is involved.

(3) Inasmuch as racial heredity makes the grosser and more visible bodily characteristics of the races, it produces attractions and antagonisms between the races. It is a general law in the animal world that likes attract and unlikes usually repel; and this holds also for the world of human social behavior. Great differences in physical appearance result in such social repulsion that some students of race problems hold, for example, that any Negro child brought up among white children would never be treated exactly the same as the white children. Historically, at any rate, it is certain that obvious racial differences have tended to develop racial separation and racial antagonisms.

It may be suggested that differences between races, when rightly understood, will be found to be *complementary*, that is, will favor a division of labor which will work towards the harmonious adjustment of all the races of mankind. There are reasons for thinking that this

will be the ultimate judgment of science. All races seem to have their strong qualities and their defects. Moreover, most of the behavior differences between races are obviously the result of culture rather than of innate hereditary peculiarities. It seems idle, therefore, to discuss whether any race is superior or inferior to another. The natural traits of some races may fit them better to live in certain environments, while the natural traits of other races may not fit them. Moreover, we should remember that heredity is not a doom of any individual, and certainly not, therefore, of any race. All races are capable of acquiring a high degree of culture, and, therefore, racial heredity does not foredoom any people to remain in a low status of culture. But just as those who work for the elevation and education of individuals must take their biological peculiarities into account, so those who plan for a people's social amelioration must take into account natural biological tendencies.

The Racial Heredity of the Negro.—This last statement raises the question as to wherein the racial heredity of the Negro may differ from the racial heredity of the white. It is generally agreed by anthropologists and biologists that mankind constitutes but a single species, developed from a single pre-human anthropoid stock. The various races of mankind have, therefore, had a common origin, and this gives no basis for racial differences in biological qualities. But as each race has developed under different geographical conditions since primitive times, they now present certain peculiar racial traits, apparently adapting each race to the environment in which it was developed. The Negro race presents the traits which adapt him to the tropics. In all the Negro's bodily make-up he shows complete adaptation to a tropical environment. The dark color of his skin, for example, is due to an enormous accumulation of pigment cells in the lower layers of his skin, and there is good reason to believe that this accumulation was favored by natural selection to exclude the injurious actinic rays of the sun which prevail in tropical sunlight. Even so, however, the student should note that the pigment cells in the white race and in the Negro are the same in quality, but vary only *in quan-*

tity. Numerous other illustrations might be given of the effect of the tropical environment upon the Negro's bodily make-up.

It is not so easy to point out the various ways in which the tropical environment influenced the development of the Negro's mind, especially his natural impulses and his native capacity to learn. This we have already seen is a matter of dispute. However, it would seem reasonable to attribute the energetic nature of the European white to the European geographical environment and to hold that the tropical environment of the Negro would fail to develop in him such an energetic nature.

Many attempts at such explanation of racial peculiarities in terms of natural selection and geographical environment have been made, and it would be a mistake to suppose that the tropical environment did not have something to do with the social behavior traits of the present American Negro. In part these traits may be due to the influence of his racial heredity; but the student should not make the even greater mistake of attributing the socially undesirable traits of the masses of American Negroes to hereditary influences. The probabilities are that they are far more to be attributed to the cultural conditions under which the Negro in the United States has lived.

Influence of Slavery on the Negro.—This brings us to the consideration of the historical conditions under which the Negro has lived in the United States. Until the 1860's those conditions were, in most cases, conditions of slavery. The influence of slavery upon the Negro has been much debated, but there is no longer any doubt that the influence of slavery on the Negro was both beneficent and maleficent. The Negroes brought to America by the slave traders were subject to a very severe artificial selection, which, perhaps, secured a better type of Negro physically on the whole, and a more docile type mentally; but the chief beneficent influence of slavery on the Negro was that it taught him to work, to some extent at least. Moreover, it gave the Negro the Anglo-Saxon tongue and the rudiments of our morality, religion, and general civilization.

On the other hand, slavery did not fit the individual or the race for a life of freedom, and did not raise moral standards much above those of Africa. The monogamic form of the family was, to be sure, enforced upon the slaves, but the family life was often broken up; for even when the owner of the slaves was kindhearted and humane, on his death his property might be sold and the families of his slaves scattered. Under such conditions it is not surprising that the Negro learned little of family morality. Again, being property himself, the Negro could not be taught properly to appreciate the rights of property. Finally slavery failed to develop in the slave that self-mastery and self-control which are necessary for free social life. Admirable as slavery was in some ways as a school for an uncultivated people, it failed utterly in other ways; and it surely should not be difficult to devise methods of training at the present time which are superior to anything that slavery as a school for the industrial training of the Negro could possibly have accomplished.

To sum up: the conditions under which the Negro lived in slavery in the United States were not such as to impart to him effectively the culture of his white masters. As has already been noted, it is culture rather than heredity that determines social behavior. Many of the most important factors in the culture of white Americans were not imparted to the Negro at all. The student should note again the great importance of civilizing traditions in the life of all peoples and races.

Statistics of the Negro Population in the United States.—The following table will show the percentage of Negroes in the population of the United States at different decades ("Negro," in census terminology, includes all persons of Negro descent):

	Per cent.		Per cent.
1790	19.27	1870	12.60
1800	18.88	1880	13.12
1810	19.03	1890	11.93
1830	18.10	1900	11.63
1840	16.84	1910	10.69
1850	15.69	1930	9.68
1860	14.13	1940	9.77

In 1860 the total number of Negroes in the population of the United States was 4,441,000. Forty years later, in 1900, the number had almost doubled, having reached 8,840,000. In 1940 the total number of Negroes had reached 12,865,000. Nevertheless, it will be seen from the above table that the percentage of Negroes in the total population has almost steadily diminished, although the Negro population almost trebled between 1860 and 1940. Between 1930 and 1940 the comparative rates of increase for the whites and Negroes were: whites, 7.2 per cent; Negroes, 8.2 per cent.

Geographical Distribution of the Negroes. The Negro problem would not be so acute in certain sections of the country if Negroes were distributed evenly over the country instead of being massed as they are in certain sections. Seventy-seven per cent of the total number of Negroes in the country in 1940 lived in the South Atlantic and South Central states. Moreover, nearly seventy per cent live in the so-called "Black Belt" states,—the "Black Belt" being a chain of counties stretching from Virginia to Texas in which over half of the population are Negroes. The following table shows the percentage of Negro population in these states of the "Black Belt" in 1940:

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Alabama	34.8	North Carolina	27.5
Arkansas	24.8	South Carolina	42.9
Florida	27.1	Tennessee	17.4
Georgia	34.7	Texas	14.4
Louisiana	34.9	Virginia	24.7
Mississippi	49.2		

However, these statistics give no idea of the massing of negroes in certain localities. In Washington County, Mississippi, for example, the Negroes numbered 48,831, the whites 18,109; in Tunica County, Mississippi, the Negroes numbered 19,335, the whites 3,245. In many counties in the "Black Belt" more than three fourths of the population are Negroes. It is in these states, especially in the Black Belt itself, that the Negro population is increasing by birth.

Increase of Negroes in States Since 1860. In none of the Southern

states has the relative Negro population increased since 1860. All of the Southern states show a smaller proportion of Negroes in their population than they did in 1860.

On the other hand, in nearly all of the Northern states the Negro population increased more rapidly than the white population between 1930 and 1940. In some of the leading industrial states of the North the Negro population has increased very rapidly since 1910. In 1910 eighty-nine per cent of the Negroes still lived in the South. But in 1940 the number of Negroes in the Northern states was 2,790,000 as against 9,904,000 in the Southern states. New York in 1940 had a Negro population of 571,000; Pennsylvania 470,000; Ohio 339,000; and Illinois 387,000. This increase of Negro population in the Northern states was, of course, due to the migration of Negroes into those states. In the decade 1920–1930 it is estimated that over 1,000,000 Negroes migrated to the North. The migration of Negroes into the North might have a greater effect in distributing the Negro population more evenly over the whole country, were it not that Negro vital statistics in these Northern states show that the Negroes in these states do not increase their numbers by birth, and, were it not for migration, would gradually decrease.

The Urban Negro Population. 48.6 per cent of the total Negro population in 1940 lived in cities, while the remainder lived in small towns and country districts. The following great cities of the South had a high percentage of Negroes in 1940:

Atlanta	34.6	Nashville	28.3
Baltimore	19.3	New Orleans	30.1
Birmingham	40.7	Richmond	31.7
Memphis	41.5	Washington	28.2

Some smaller Southern cities have, of course, a higher percentage of Negroes in their population.

The large Negro populations in some Northern cities also should not be overlooked. The census of 1940 affords the following statistics:

New York	6.1 per cent (458,000)	Philadelphia	13.0 per cent (250,000)
Chicago	8.2 per cent (277,000)	Detroit	9.2 per cent (149,000)

It should be remembered, however, that about half of the Negroes in the United States still live in rural districts. This is fortunate; for on the whole statistics show that the most prosperous and socially adjusted Negro is the Negro on the farm. Within recent years there has been a considerable movement of the Negroes to the cities. This is extremely significant for the social condition of the Negro, because the mass of Negroes, not yet adapted in general to an industrial civilization, are still less adapted to the environment which the modern city affords them.

The Social Condition of the Negroes in the United States. (1) *Intermixture of Races.* Ever since the Negro came to this country he has been having his racial characteristics modified by the infusion of white blood. The census of 1910 attempted to make an estimate of the number of Negroes of mixed blood in the United States. The number returned as being of mixed blood was 1,660,000, but the best authorities agree that this number understated the actual number. Experts in ethnology now estimate that from one half to two thirds of the Negroes in the United States show traces of white intermixture. The higher estimate, that two thirds of the Negroes of the United States have more or less white blood, is now generally accepted by those who have carefully investigated the matter. Of course the proportion of Negroes of mixed blood varies greatly in different localities. In communities in the border states frequently more than two thirds of the Negroes show marked traces of white intermixture. But in the isolated rural regions of the South, where the Negroes predominate, the full-blood Negro is still the more common type.

This infusion of white blood into a portion of the Negro population is significant sociologically. It is the Negroes of mixed blood who are ambitious socially and who present some of the most acute phases of the Negro problem. It is from the mixed bloods that the leaders of the race in this country have come. The pure Negro without intermixture of white blood has seldom proved capable of leadership. Such men as Booker T. Washington, Professor Du Bois, and most other Negro leaders have had a considerable mixture of white blood.

Dr. E. B. Reuter has shown that out of 4,267 prominent Negro leaders in various lines only 447, a little over 10 per cent, can be considered as probably pure-blood Negroes. Indeed, practically all of the Negroes who have been eminent in literature, science, art, or statesmanship have come from the class of mixed bloods.

But the infusion of white blood has also been in some ways a detriment to the Negro. The illegitimate offspring resulting from the unions of white fathers and Negro mothers are frequently the product of conditions of vice. Under such conditions the child of mixed origin frequently has a degenerate heredity and, coming into the world as a bastard, is also more or less in disfavor with both races; hence the social environment of the mulatto as well as his heredity is sometimes peculiarly unfavorable. It is not surprising, therefore, to find among the mulattoes a great amount of constitutional diseases and a great tendency to crime and immorality. Also, mulatto women are more frequently debauched by white men than the pure-blood Negro women, and for this reason Negro women of mixed blood are more apt to be immoral. So we see that while the mixed bloods have furnished the leaders of their race, they have also furnished an undue proportion of its vice and crime. This is exactly what we should expect when we understand the social conditions existing between the races and the origin and social environment of the mulatto.

The crime and vice and constitutional diseases of the mulatto do not prove that degeneracy results from the intermixture of the two races, as was once supposed. On the contrary, as we have already seen, all of these things result from the fact that the crossing of the races takes place under socially abnormal conditions, that is, under conditions of vice. This is not, however, true in all cases, and particularly it was not true of all intermixture that took place under the regime of slavery. Intermixture under slavery approached not vice, as we understand the word, but polygamy. Consequently some of the best blood of the South runs in the veins of some of the mulattoes. Also, we have from other countries examples of the crossing of the two races, Negro and white, without physical degeneracy. In the

West Indies and in Brazil this crossing is frequently taking place, and many of the best families of those countries have a slight amount of Negro blood in their veins. From instances like this, gathered from all over the world, it has generally been concluded by anthropologists that no evil physiological results necessarily follow the intermixture of races, even the most diverse, but that all supposed physiological evils coming from the intermixture of races really come from social rather than from physiological causes.

From the point of view of the white race and from the point of view of the Negro race such racial intermixture, outside of the bounds of law, may be for many reasons undesirable. But we are here concerned with noting only the social effect of the intermixture that has gone on in the past; and we see that on the one hand it has resulted in creating a class of so-called Negroes in whom white blood and the ambitions and energy of the white race predominate, and on the other hand it has also resulted in creating a degenerate mixed stock that furnishes over half of the criminals and vicious persons belonging to the so-called Negro race.

(2) *Criminality of the Negro.* One of the most important features of the Negro problem in the United States is the tendency toward crime among the Negroes; and this, as we have just seen, is especially manifest in those of mixed origin. The census of 1910 showed that there were then in the South five white prisoners to every ten thousand whites, but thirty-two Negro prisoners to every ten thousand Negroes, while in the North there were nine white prisoners to every ten thousand whites, but eighty Negro prisoners to every ten thousand Negroes. Statistics show that the Negro is everywhere more criminal than the white, and that his tendency toward crime increases as we go North, doubtless largely because in the North he lives in cities in a more complex environment and finds greater difficulty in making social adjustments. Moreover, Negro crime has been increasing. In the city of Chicago the number of Negro men 21 years of age and over charged with felonies rose from 333 per 10,000 of their population in 1915–1919 to 741 in 1925–1929; while the num-

ber of Negro men charged with misdemeanors rose in the same decade from 1,587 per 10,000 to 5,210. Moreover, in five other great Northern cities the number of Negro men and boys charged with felonies in 1930 was 490 per 10,000 of their population, as against 84 for the native whites. Of commitments for serious crimes to Federal and state prisons in 1939 the Census Bureau reported that 26.3 per cent were commitments of Negroes, which was nearly three times the per cent of Negroes in the total population. This high ratio of Negro crime in the United States has persisted for several decades.

The United States census of 1940 reports that out of a total of 8,208 homicides in the United States in that year 3,539 were homicides of Negro men—at a rate eleven times the rate of homicides of white men in the United States. Inasmuch as the greater number of these homicides were committed by Negroes, these figures again suggest the prevalence of crime in the Negro population of the United States. Dr. Edwin R. Embree, President of the Rosenwald Fund, goes so far as to say: "In crime the Negro has an atrocious record. He contributes far more than his quota both to the prison population and to current arrests."

There can be no doubt that Negro crime, whether in the South or in the North, is largely a matter of the Negroes' social environment and of their culture and traditions; for there are great Negro communities outside of the United States that are relatively free from crime. This fact is sufficient to prove that the elevation of the Negro's culture and the furnishing of fair conditions of life would greatly lessen Negro crime in the United States. However, we must remember that the difficulties which the Negro confronts in adjusting himself to our urban civilization make the eradication of Negro crime a difficult matter.

Vice accompanies crime among the American Negroes. The United States Census Bureau statistics of illegitimacy in 1941 showed that the percentage of illegitimate births among the white population that year was 1.9 per cent, while the percentage among the Negroes was 17.6. In other words, over one sixth of all the Negro births

in the United States that year were illegitimate, as against less than one fiftieth among the whites. In some Southern states the proportion of illegitimate births in the Negro population was as high as one fifth, and in a few Southern cities it was even higher. Of course, statistics of illegitimacy are not statistics of vice, but they at any rate throw a light upon the moral condition of the Negro in this regard, and particularly show the demoralization of his family life.

(3) *Negro Pauperism.* We have no good statistics on Negro pauperism, but such as we have seem to indicate that the state of dependence of the Negro is very great. It is reliably estimated that during the great depression of the 1930's from 25 to 40 per cent of all the Negro families in the United States became dependent. In nearly all communities where organized charities exist the Negroes contribute to the dependent population far out of proportion to their numbers. No doubt, also, from 50 to 75 per cent of the total Negro population of the United States live in poverty as distinguished from pauperism.

(4) *Negro Vital Statistics.* Both the death rate and the birth rate of Negroes in the South are very high, although accurate statistics of the birth rate are difficult to obtain. In Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina in the rural districts in 1939, the Negro birth rate was more than twice the Negro death rate. On the other hand, in the North it is uncertain whether the Negro can continue to increase by the excess of births over deaths. Often in Northern states the Negro fails to reproduce sufficiently to keep up his numbers. In Missouri in 1939, for example, there were 3,874 Negro births and 4,050 Negro deaths. Careful study of the vital statistics of Northern states supports this conclusion.

The vital statistics of Southern cities show that the Negro death rate in cities is very much higher than the white death rate. In ten Southern cities in 1890–1894, Hoffman found the average death rate for whites to be 20 per thousand of the white population, and for Negroes to be 32.6 per thousand of the Negro population. Fifteen great cities of the South had in 1940 an average death rate of 10.2 for the whites and of 16.4 for the Negroes. In several cities the Negro

death rate was nearly twice that of the whites. When these mortality statistics are analyzed, moreover, they show that while Negro mortality at all ages is greater than white mortality, it is greatest among Negro children under fifteen years of age. This is of course largely because of the Negro mothers' ignorance of the proper care of children, but it also indicates that natural selection is at work among the American Negroes, eliminating the biologically unfit.

Conclusions from Negro Vital Statistics. Three important conclusions may be drawn from the Negro vital and population statistics—conclusions which are well worth emphasizing. (1) the Negro population is now increasing slightly faster than the white, owing largely to its high birth rate, and there is no indication that the Negro population will decrease. It is probable, indeed, that at the end of the twentieth century the Negro population of the United States will be in the neighborhood of fifteen millions. The view of some students of the Negro problem that the Negro is destined to an early extinction in this country is an hypothesis as yet not substantiated by statistical facts.

(2) While the Negro is destined to be with us always, so far as we can see, yet owing to the fact of intermixture of races he will be less and less a pure Negro, so that at the end of the twentieth century the Negroes in the United States will be much nearer the white type than at the present time.

(3) The high death rate among the Negroes indicates that a process of natural selection is going on among them. Now, natural selection means the elimination of the unfit,—the dying out of those who cannot adapt themselves to their environment. This selective process will tend toward the survival of the more fit elements among the Negroes, and, therefore, towards bringing the Negro up to the standard of the whites. The misery and vice which we see among the present American Negroes are simply in a large degree the expression of the working of a process of natural selection among them. It would be preferable, however, if the white race could by education and other means substitute to some degree at least artificial selection for

the miseries and brutality of the natural process of eliminating the unfit. This the white race should do to protect itself as well as to raise the Negro.

The Economic Condition of the Negro.—In 1903 it was estimated that the total taxable wealth of the Negroes of the United States in 1900 was only about $300,000,000. In 1930, however, reliable estimates placed the taxable wealth of the Negroes at $2,500,000,000, or about $200 per head. This is, of course, a small sum compared with the $2,900 per capita estimated to be owned by the whites. However, the advance of the Negro in accumulating property since his emancipation has been steady. At the close of the Civil War the Negro had no property whatever, with the exception of the few freedmen and of those few cases in which old masters had set up their emancipated slaves as small farmers. In 1920, Negroes owned 218,612 farms, valued at $522,178,000, more than half of which were owned unencumbered, while they operated as tenants or managers 707,096 more.

However, since 1920 there has been a decline in the number of Negro farm owners in the South. In 1935 there were only 186,065 of them, while the number of Negro farm tenants had declined to 629,301, of whom 45 per cent were "croppers," paying no cash, but only a share of the crop, as rent. Moreover, the value of the land owned by Negro farmers in the South had declined to $208,000,000. This unfavorable change in the Southern Negroes' economic condition must be ascribed mainly to the depression in agriculture.

Nearly half of the Negroes gainfully employed are still in agricultural occupations. While they have met with success in other occupations, Negroes have been most successful in agriculture, and where conditions have been favorable, Negro farmers have made rapid progress. This is one factor in the comparatively rapid accumulation of property made by Negroes in some Southern states, as in North Carolina, where the value of taxable property owned by Negroes increased between 1917 and 1928 over 200 per cent, or from $36,000,000 to over $110,000,000.

It must be said here, as Booker T. Washington urged, that the Negro problem is largely of an industrial nature. It is the unsatisfactoriness of the Negro as a worker, as a producing agent, that gives rise largely to the friction between the two races. The Negro race needs more skilled workers. Moreover, the Negro worker has often not yet become adapted to a system of free contract and is frequently unreliable as a laborer. This breeds continued antagonism between the races. When the Negro becomes an efficient producer and a property owner, a long step will have been taken toward the solution of the Negro problem.

Educational Progress Among the Negroes.—The educational progress among the Negroes has been more satisfactory than their industrial progress. At the time of the emancipation 90 per cent of all the Negroes in the United States were illiterate, since nearly all the slave states had laws forbidding the education of Negroes. Since the emancipation there has been a rapid decrease of illiteracy. In 1880, 70 per cent of the Negroes above the age of ten years were still reported as illiterate; in 1900, 44.5 per cent; and in 1940, 10 per cent.

An even better measure of educational progress in our Negro population is afforded by the 1940 census statistics of educational attainment of all persons in the United States 25 years old and over. The census reported that the median number of years of school completed by persons 25 years old or over was 8.4 years, the equivalent of slightly more than eight grades. For the native whites the median number of years completed was 8.8; for the Negroes 5.7, a little less than six grades.

In the school year 1935–36 in eighteen Southern states there were 2,488,000 Negro children enrolled in the public schools, this number being 82.8 per cent of the Negro population of the school age (five to seventeen). The number of white children enrolled was 7,774,000, or 84.2 per cent of the white population of school age. But the average daily attendance of the white school children was 81.4 per cent, while the average daily attendance of the Negro school children was 77.4 per cent. These statistics fail to indicate the utter inade-

quacy of much of the present education of Negro children. In many districts of the South, Negro schools are open less than six months in a year. The equipment of the schools is often very inadequate, and, according to the Federal Office of Education, "a considerable proportion of the teachers are deficient in proper training." Of the total number of pupils in Negro schools, 44.2 per cent are in the first two grades, and 68.2 per cent are in the first four grades. According to the Federal Office of Education, in the Southern states in 1936, the amount expended for teachers' salaries in public schools for white children was $49.30 per child, while for Negro children it was only $12.04. The Office furnishes the following statistics of schools for Negroes in 1936: public high schools for Negroes numbered 1108 with 118,000 students in the high school grades proper. In 1936 there were 121 colleges and institutions of higher learning for Negroes, 18 of them being supported by public funds. The combined income of these institutions was $13,130,000, and they had 17,852 students of college grade. Nevertheless, the Office found in 1926 that these institutions were not producing enough teachers, physicians, ministers, and skilled craftsmen to meet the needs of the race. It concluded that the immediate need of the American Negro is "more education, better education, and higher education."

Political Conditions.—The Mississippi constitution of 1890 provided that voters must be able to read or interpret a clause in the constitution of the United States. Since then a majority of the Southern states and practically all of the states of the "Black Belt" have embodied either in their constitutions or in their laws provisions for disfranchising the Negro voter by literacy tests, "Grandfather Clauses," or poll tax laws. Louisiana made the provision that a person must be able to read and write or be a lineal descendant of some person who voted prior to 1860. This was the famous "Grandfather Clause," which proved popular in a number of Southern states. These laws and constitutional provisions were evidently designed to disfranchise the Negro voter. The Federal Supreme Court in 1915, however, declared "grandfather laws" invalid, reaffirming the validity

of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. In 1942 seven Southern states still retained poll-tax laws.

Regarding all of this legislation it may be said that it had perhaps both good and bad effects. In so far as it tended to keep the Negro out of politics this was a good effect; but it rather succeeded in keeping "the Negro question" in politics; and the evident injustice and inequality of some of the laws reacted to lower the whole tone of political morality in the South. Again, the very provision of these laws to insure the disfranchisement of the illiterate Negro tended in some instances, at least, to discourage Negro education, because the promoters of these laws in most cases did not aim to exclude simply the illiterate Negro vote, but practically the entire Negro vote. It is evident that a party designing to disfranchise the Negro through this means would not be very zealous for the Negro's education.

Reconstruction of our Policy Toward the Negro.—Many solutions have been proposed for the Negro problem. Among them are (1) immediate admission of the Negroes to full social equality with the whites; (2) popular education of the Negroes along literary and intellectual lines; (3) deportation to Africa or to South America; (4) colonization in some state or in territory adjacent to the United States; (5) extinction through natural selection. It must be said at once that all of these solutions are either impossible or fatuous. The Negro is destined to remain a part of our nation. This is the *first* principle upon which a sound policy' toward the Negro must be based. Accordingly, any sane solution of the Negro problem must look toward the harmonious adjustment of the relations of the two races within the nation. The proposed solutions just mentioned fail to accomplish this result, and must be discarded in favor of a more rational and scientific policy.

The *second* principle necessary for a sound policy toward the Negro is that the so-called Negro problem is essentially the same as the Indian problem or the problem of any backward people or race. It is the problem of how a relatively large mass of people, inferior in culture, can be adjusted to the civilization of a people much their

superior in culture; how the socially and industrially inefficient can be made over into the socially and industrially efficient. Without any injustice to the Negro we should note that the Negro masses of this country are still essentially an uncultivated people, though surrounded by civilization. Slavery failed to render the mass of Negroes capable of participating fully in our civilization, and all that has been done for the Negro since emancipation has likewise relatively failed. Accordingly the problem still remains of how we can get the mass of Negroes to assimilate fully the social standards, ideals, and values of our civilization. The problem is not greatly different from what it would be if the present American Negroes were descendants of savage aborigines that had peopled this country before the white man came. We must find a way of making them a harmonious and helpful element in our national household; or, as we say of the immigrant, of Americanizing them.

Mr. Booker T. Washington said that the Negro is bound to become adjusted to our civilization because he is surrounded by the white man's civilization on every hand. This optimistic view, which seems to dismiss the Negro problem as requiring no solution, is, however, not well supported by many facts, as we have just seen. Everywhere we have evidence that the Negro when left to himself fails in social adjustment, and the statistics of his increasing vice and crime show quite conclusively that the Negro is not becoming adjusted to the white man's civilization in many cases in spite of considerable efforts which are being put forth in his behalf. While the writer is very far from taking a pessimistic view of this or any other social problem, he believes that most of the solutions that have thus far been tried have relatively failed, and that more radical methods need to be adopted if the Negro is to become a useful social and industrial element in our society.

Undoubtedly the primary adjustment to be made by any backward people is the adjustment on the economic side. Only when the Negro becomes adjusted to the economic side of his life will there be a solid foundation for the development of something higher. People must

be taught how to be efficient, self-sustaining, productive members of society economically before they can be taught to be good citizens. The American Negro in other words must be taught to be "good for something" as well as to be good. The inadequacy of much common-school education of the Negro has been largely for the reason that it has failed to help him in any efficient way to adjust himself industrially. Oftentimes indeed it has had the contrary effect, and the slightly educated Negro has been the one who has been least valuable as a producer. The common-school education has not been such a failure with the white child, for the reason that the white child has been taught industry and morality at home, but these the Negro frequently fails to get in his home life. Moreover, the common-school education of the white child has usually been simply the foundation upon which after school days he, as a citizen, has built up a wider culture. But the Negro, on account of his environment, if not naturally, has proved incapable of going on with his education and building on it after getting out of school. Moreover, as has already been noted, under the present complex conditions of our social life the common school is no longer an efficient socializing agent, even for the white children. The present school system is inadequate, not only for the Negro race, but also, though not in the same degree, for the white race. Popular education on the old lines can never do very much to solve the Negro problem.

This does not lead, however, to the conclusion that all training and education for the Negro race is foredoomed to failure. On the contrary all the experiments of missionaries in dealing with backward peoples has led to the conclusion that an all-round education in which industrial and moral training are made prominent can relatively adjust to our civilization even the most backward human groups. Wherever the missionaries have introduced industrial education and adjusted their converts to what is perhaps the fundamental side of our civilization, the economic, they have met with the largest degree of success. This success of missionary endeavors along this line has led to the establishment of similar industrial training schools for the

Negro in this country, and it may be said regarding such schools for the Negro as Hampton and Tuskegee that they have proved an even more unqualified success than their predecessors originated by the missionaries. But these schools are as yet very far from solving the Negro problem in this country, for the reason, as we have already seen, that they affect such a small proportion of the Negro population. Not more than four per cent of Negro children in the early 1940's were probably receiving industrial training.

It should be emphasized that industrial training in no way precludes an all-round education. It is not meant that industrial education shall replace all other forms of education, but rather that it shall be added to ordinary education in order to enrich the educational process; and it should be added also that industrial training, while of itself having a strong uplifting moral influence, is not sufficient to socialize without explicit teaching of social ideals and standards. Schools that attempted to give such an all-round education to Negro children would, of course, in no way cut off the possibility of higher and professional education for those who are especially fitted to become leaders, and who should be encouraged to go on with advanced studies.

Positive Constructive Measures. If we accept the view that what the American Negro needs to adjust him to our civilization is an all-round, socialized education which will emphasize industrial training, especially training for those agricultural and other rural occupations in which the Negro masses find their best success, let us note the concrete measures which are necessary to realize this program.

(1) There must be adequately equipped common and higher schools to give such training. Such schools equipped for industrial training—that is, for training in agriculture and mechanical arts for the boys and in household arts for the girls—would doubtless cost a good deal of money. While the investment of money in such schools would undoubtedly repay many fold in the increased productive capacity of the Negro population, and so in the increased productive power of the whole nation, yet the Southern states should not be

asked to carry this burden alone. They should not, because the condition of the Negro is a national, and not a local, responsibility. Properly equipped schools for the education of the Negro can scarcely be secured without Federal aid. This means Federal subsidies for education, and ultimately, perhaps, a national system of education. But as this is needed also for the whites, especially for the large mass of illiterate whites in the South, there can be little objection to such a policy. World Wars should have taught us not to be niggardly in spending money on socially necessary projects. The cost of a few modern battleships would furnish ample funds for the industrial education of the Negro for a decade.

(2) There must be secured properly trained teachers to give such education. A sufficient number of such teachers cannot at present be found among the Negroes. While Negro teachers should be preferred whenever they are competent, and should be trained as rapidly as possible, yet white teachers must be enlisted for the training of the Negro if any adequate educational policy is to be entered upon. There are the gravest reasons, indeed, why white teachers should be more extensively employed in Negro schools if education of the Negro is to be a success. The mass of Negro teachers now employed are far below even the low standards set for teachers of white schools. They are unqualified for the task of civilizing and socializing their race. Under such teachers any scheme of education for the Negro is bound to be a failure; for it is well recognized that the vital element in the success of any scheme of education is the teacher. "Sound policy," says the Federal Office of Education, "requires white management and white teachers to have some part in the education of the race."

If, therefore, industrial and social training is to be generally introduced into the schools for Negroes—if Negro education is to aim at the social adjustment of the Negro—then a way must be found of reintroducing white teachers in some measure into Negro schools. Directly after the Civil War Southern white teachers were extensively employed in Negro schools; but as a result of increasing race

friction and of the Negroes foolishly demanding the positions for themselves, white teachers have come gradually to be excluded from Negro schools. It would seem, however, that recognition by both races of the exigencies of the educational situation and of the need of an attitude of mutual service might easily remove the difficulties in the way of securing an enlarged co-operation of white teachers in Negro education. *Unless, indeed, opportunities are maintained for working together in the higher tasks of civilization,* such as education, *the social separation of the two races must finally result in disaster to both.*

(3) This brings us to the third thing which is the most necessary of all for the solution of the Negro problem, and that is intelligent co-operation by the members of both races, especially their leaders. Without such co-operation it is idle to think that properly equipped schools and properly trained teachers for the education of the Negro can be obtained, or that the new education for the Negro can be successfully inaugurated. Most of the Negroes, often misled by unwise leaders, still prefer the education of the older type, failing to see that industrial training coupled with all-round education offers the one secure pathway of social advance for their race. The masses of unenlightened Southern white people, on the other hand, also do not wish the new education for the Negro, because they believe that it will give him an advantage. For this reason many would probably oppose Federal aid in the education of the Negro. They fail to see that anything that is done for a depressed element in society will ultimately benefit all society. In particular, they fail to see that the one great impediment to the economic and cultural development and enrichment of the South is its untrained Negro population. Says the Southern University Race Commission: "The inadequate provision for the education of the Negro is more than an injustice to him; it is an injury to the white man. The South can not realize its destiny if one third of its population is undeveloped and inefficient."

But it is the white man who must lead the way in this matter. He must persuade the Negro that rightly directed education is the way out, and extend to the Negro all needed help and good will. The

question, therefore, ultimately becomes a question of educating the whites and of forming a proper public opinion regarding the education of the Negro. When the leaders of both races once see the need of working together in harmony and in good will, the difficulties in the way of securing proper education for the Negro will be easily surmounted. While, therefore, the Negro problem is from one point of view largely a question of the industrial training and adjustment of the Negro, from another point of view it is a moral question which can be solved only when the socially superior race takes the right attitude toward the socially inferior race—namely, the attitude of service.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

REUTER, E. B., *The American Race Problem*, Chaps. II-VII.
REUTER, E. B., *Population Problems*, Chap. XVIII.
THOMPSON, W. S., *Population Problems*, 3d Ed., Chap. X.

For more extended reading:

BRAWLEY, B., *Social History of the American Negro*, Rev. Ed.
CHICAGO RACE COMMISSION, *The Negro in Chicago.*
DOWD, J., *The Negro in American Life.*
DU BOIS, W. E. B., *The Negro.*
DU BOIS, W. E. B., *The Souls of Black Folk.*
EMBREE, E. R., *American Negroes: A Handbook.*
EMBREE, E. R., *Brown America.*
GARTH, T. R., *Race Psychology.*
HART, H. N., *The Science of Social Relations*, Chaps. XIX-XX.
JOHNSON, C. S., *The Negro in American Civilization.*
JOHNSTON, H., *The Negro in the New World.*
LOCKE, A. L., *The New Negro.*
KLINEBERG, O., *Negro Intelligence.*
KLINEBERG, O., *Race Differences.*
MECKLIN, J. M., *Democracy and Race Friction.*
MILLER, K., *Race Adjustment.*
ODUM, H. W., *Man's Quest for Social Guidance*, Chap. XII.

OLDHAM, J. H., *Christianity and the Race Problem.*
RAPER, A., *The Tragedy of Lynching.*
REUTER, E. B., *Race Mixture.*
SCHRIEKE, B., *Alien Americans.*
THOMPSON, E. T., Editor, *Race Relations and the Race Problem.*
WASHINGTON, B., *The Future of the American Negro.*
WASHINGTON, B., *The Story of the Negro.*
WEATHERFORD, W. D., *The Negro from Africa to America*, Chaps. X-XVII.
WEATHERFORD, W. D., and JOHNSON, C. S., *Race Relations.*
WOOFTER, T. J., *The Basis of Racial Adjustment.*
WOOFTER, T. J., JR., *Negro Problems in Cities.*
WOOFTER, T. J., JR., *Race and Ethnic Groups in American Life.*
WORK, M. N., Editor, *Negro Year Book: An Annual Encyclopedia of the Negro*, published by Tuskegee Institute.
YOUNG, DONALD, *American Minority Peoples.*
Negro Education, Bulletins Nos. 38, 39 (1936) and 7 (1928) of the Bureau of Education.
The Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915, Bureau of the Census.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What is racial heredity? Explain fully, especially as to how it may affect conduct. Illustrate.

2. To what extent may racial heredity possibly affect social evolution? Illustrate.

3. Does recognition of the influence of racial heredity lead to a fatalistic attitude as regards racial problems? Why, or why not?

4. In what ways is the Negro's racial heredity probably different from the white man's? Why? Is it inferior? Give full reasons for your answer.

5. What influence did slavery have upon the American Negro?

6. Is the proportion of Negroes in the population of the United States increasing or decreasing? Summarize statistics.

7. How is the Negro population distributed geographically? Why is this? Why is the Negro moving north?

8. Would it be better to have more Negroes in the North and fewer in the South?

9. Is the movement of the Negroes to the cities good or bad for the race? Why?

10. What are the biological effects of race intermixture? What have been the sociological effects in the case of the Negro?

11. How would you explain the high criminality of the Negro? Why does it increase as you go north?

12. Why are Negro vital statistics so important? What three important conclusions may we draw from them?

13. How far are industrial conditions among the Negroes an index and a cause of their general social condition?

14. To what extent has Negro education been a success? Is it at present well organized and adequately provided for? Give facts.

15. Should complete and absolute suffrage be given to the Negro?

16. What would be an adequate solution of the Negro problem?

17. Is cultural assimilation of the Negro desirable? Is the development of the Negro as a separate group within our white population possible?

18. Do the same principles hold here as with the immigrant?

19. If the social assimilation of the Negro is desirable, how can it be brought about? How can, in other words, a harmonious adjustment of the relations of the two races be effected?

20. Why should the Negro be educated industrially? What are the practical difficulties? Illustrate.

21. Is racial antipathy a factor in the Negro problem? What is the psychology of racial antipathy?

For classroom discussion:

1. How is race related to heredity? In what three ways might racial heredity conceivably affect human relations?

2. May racial differences be socially valuable? Are all human races capable of acquiring a high culture?

3. Is the Negro population of the Northern states as socially well-adjusted as the Negro in the South? Give evidence.

4. What methods have been most successful in the cultural development of backward peoples?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Has Brazil solved the Negro problem?

CHAPTER XII

THE GROWTH OF CITIES

THE urbanization of population in the leading nations of the modern world has greatly intensified practically all social problems. At the same time the growth of cities has brought about conditions of living which are relatively new to mankind. Whether human beings can adapt themselves to the new biological, psychological, and social conditions which city life presents, and still keep sound in body and mind, remains to be demonstrated. It is for this reason that a great social thinker has said that "the growth of large cities constitutes, perhaps, the greatest of all the problems of modern civilization."

The student should note at the beginning that the problems presented by the urbanization of social life are very different at the present time from the problems of city life in the past. The great cities of the modern world are largely industrial centers and as such they present in an intensified degree all of the problems of our industrial civilization. Let us note, however, some of the leading facts regarding the history of cities.

The Origin and Development of the City.—The first cities were military strongholds and places of worship. Comparatively few of the total population of a country lived within their walls, except in times of danger from enemies. From being military and religious centers, cities became, also, markets or commercial centers. Such were the walled towns of the Middle Ages. The typical cities of western Europe remained surrounded by high walls down to the modern era, while within their walls dwelt a comparatively dense population, living mainly by trade and commerce. It was not until the industrial revolution, early in the nineteenth century, had trans-

formed industry and transportation, that we find the modern type of city, which is an industrial center, emerging.

Thus, while the city is as old as civilization itself, the present problem of the city is comparatively new. No great proportion of the population of any country previous to the nineteenth century lived in cities, for the people got their living mainly through occupations carried on in country districts. The modern city, then, is a product of modern industrial development, of our machine civilization, not of the mere increase of numbers. So true is this, that in a very populous country such as India, which has not yet been greatly affected by modern industrial methods, we still find nearly ninety per cent of the population living under rural conditions.

In all probability this was also true of the people living in classic antiquity. While we know that there was a considerable development of cities in the later phases of Greco-Roman civilization, probably the proportion of the total population of the Roman Empire living in cities was comparatively small. Moreover, the populations of ancient cities have often been exaggerated. Probably at the height of its power, the population of Athens did not exceed 100,000; Carthage, 700,000; Rome, 500,000; Alexandria, 500,000; Nineveh and Babylon, 1,000,000. All the great cities of the ancient world practically disappeared with the fall of Rome. After Rome's fall, Constantinople was the only large city with over 100,000 population in all Europe for centuries. Down to 1600 A.D., indeed, there were only fourteen cities in all Europe with a population of over 100,000; and even in 1800, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were only twenty-three such cities. But at the end of the nineteenth century, in 1900, there were one hundred and forty-six such cities in Europe, representing twelve per cent of the entire population, while in 1930 there were no less than two hundred and thirty-two such cities. Moreover, while in 1800 less than three per cent of the total population of Europe lived in cities, in 1930 the total urban population of Europe was over forty per cent. Again, all of the great European capitals began to develop their present enormous populations within

the nineteenth century. Thus, the population of London in 1800 was 964,000, while in 1940 it had reached 4,094,000, or in the total area policed, 8,655,000; the population of Paris in 1800 was 547,000, in 1940 it was 2,829,000; the population of Berlin in 1800 was only 172,000, in 1939 it was 4,332,000; the population of Moscow in 1939 had reached 4,137,000 and of Tokyo 5,875,000. Meanwhile, in the New World New York grew from 60,000 in 1800 to 7,455,000 in 1940, and Buenos Aires from 5,000 to 2,364,000. These figures are cited to show that from four fifths to nine tenths of the growth of the greatest cities of the world has taken place since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The Growth of Cities in the United States.—According to the terminology of the United States Census Bureau, a place with a population of 2500 or over is counted as *urban*. Places of from 2500 to 25,000 are called small cities; places from 25,000 to 100,000 medium-sized cities; and places over 100,000 large or great cities. It will be well to bear these distinctions in mind in discussing the problem of the city, because the problem of city life becomes much more intense when the population of a place exceeds 100,000. It is mainly the problem of the great city which will be discussed in this chapter.

In 1800 there were only five cities in the United States of more than 10,000 population. These cities contained a fraction less than four per cent of the total population. In 1900, on the other hand, there were 447 cities in the United States with a population of over 10,000, and these cities contained nearly 32 per cent of the total population, while nearly 20 per cent lived in 38 great cities of over 100,000 population. By 1940 the number of cities in the United States of more than 10,000 population had increased to 1077, and these cities contained 47.6 per cent of the total population; 28.7 per cent lived in 92 cities of more than 100,000 population each, while 47.8 per cent lived in 140 metropolitan districts.

Moreover, during the whole of the nineteenth century the cities of the United States grew much more rapidly than its rural population, and this was especially true in the closing decades. From 1860

to 1930 the total population of the United States quadrupled, but its urban population multiplied more than tenfold. From 1930 to 1940 the urban population of the United States increased from 68,954,000 to 74,423,000, or 7.9 per cent, while the "rural population," including in that phrase not only the population living in the open country, but also in all towns under 2500 inhabitants, increased from 53,820,000 to 57,245,000, or 6.4 per cent. If, however, we take only the population living in the country on the farm, excluding all other country dwellers, we find that the farm population between 1930 and 1940 increased only 0.2 per cent. Between 1920 and 1930 the farm population lost to the cities all of its natural increase and 1,201,000 besides. However, in the decade 1930–1940, during the great depression, this movement was temporarily reversed, and for at least two years the cities showed a loss of population. But, as stated above, the decade as a whole showed a net gain in urban population of 7.9 per cent.

Distribution of the Urban Population of the United States. If the urban population of the United States were distributed relatively uniformly among the several states, the problem of the city would be very different from what it is; but the urban population is largely concentrated in a few states. Nearly 40 per cent of the urban population is found in the New England and Middle Atlantic states; and if we add the East North Central states, nearly two thirds of the urban population is in these three divisions. The six states of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and California contain one half of the urban population of the whole country.

The states with over half their population urban in 1940 were Rhode Island, 91.6 per cent; Massachusetts, 89.4 per cent; New York, 82.8 per cent; New Jersey, 81.6 per cent; Illinois, 73.6 per cent; California, 71.0 per cent; Connecticut, 67.8 per cent; Ohio, 66.8 per cent; Pennsylvania, 66.5 per cent; Michigan, 65.7 per cent; Maryland, 59.3 per cent; New Hampshire, 57.6 per cent; Utah, 55.5 per cent; Indiana, 55.1 per cent; Florida, 55.1 per cent; Wisconsin, 53.5 per cent; Washington, 53.1 per cent; Colorado, 52.6 per cent; Delaware, 52.3 per cent; and Missouri, 51.8 per cent.

It will be noticed that most of these states with a large urban population are the great manufacturing states of the Union. The proportion of urban to rural population is, indeed, directly proportionate to the industrialization of the population. It will also be noticed that only three of these states with a population more than one half urban are southern, namely, Maryland, Florida, and Delaware. This is due to the fact that heretofore the South has been largely agricultural; consequently only a few of the great cities of the country are found within its borders, though since about 1920 several Southern states have rapidly increased their urban population.

There are but few countries in Europe that are as urban as so many of our American states. The following European countries had in the 1930's a very large per cent of urban population: England and Wales, about 80 per cent; Scotland, 77 per cent; Germany, 65 per cent; Italy, 68 per cent; France, 52 per cent; Holland, 47 per cent. On the other hand, in European Russia in 1926 only 17.3 per cent of the population was urban. It will be noted that the most urban of our states, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey, surpass all European countries in the percentage of population living in cities. This is due to the fact that these states have specialized in manufacturing industry more than any European country, with the exception of England and Wales.

Before leaving the statistics of the growth of cities, it may be worth while to note that there are developing in this country certain great urban centers which promise to show, even in the near future, the most extensive urbanization of population known to the world; for example, a line of cities and suburban communities is now developing which will in the near future connect New York and Boston on the one hand and New York, Philadelphia, and Washington on the other hand. Thus in a few years, stretching from Washington to Boston, a distance of five hundred miles, there promises to be a continuous chain of urban communities with practically no rural districts between them. In a sense, this will constitute one great city with a population of twenty millions or upwards. Other urban centers

though not so extensive, are also developing at other points in the United States. We already in 1940 have nine "metropolitan districts" with more than one million population in each; and it is probable that at the end of the twentieth century this country will have at least a dozen cities with a population of over one million. As far as we can see at the present time, there is no end in the near future to this growth of the urbanization of our population; for the causes of this great growth of cities seem inherent in our civilization.

Causes of the Growth of Great Cities.—There may be distinguished two classes of causes of the growth of cities: (1) general or social causes, and (2) minor or individual causes. It is the social causes, the causes inherent in our civilization, which are of particular interest to us. The chief social causes are three in number:

1. *The Diminishing Relative Importance of Agriculture in the Life of Man.* Once agriculture was the all-embracing occupation. Practically all goods were produced upon the farm. Now, however, man's wants have so greatly increased that the primitive industries of the farm can no longer satisfy these wants, and in order to satisfy them men have developed large manufacturing industries. Moreover, fewer men are needed on the farms to produce the same amount of raw material as was produced formerly by the labor of many. This has come about mostly through labor-saving machines. The invention and application of labor-saving machines to the industries of the farm has made it possible to dispense with a great number of men. It is estimated that fifty men with modern farm machinery can do the work of five hundred European peasants without such machinery. Consequently, the four hundred and fifty who have been displaced by farm machinery must find other work, and they find it mainly in manufacturing industries. Again, the scientific and capitalistic methods in the agriculture of the present have much the same effect as labor-saving machines. They have greatly increased agricultural production and at the same time lessened the amount of labor. The opening up also of new and fertile regions which were very productive in the nineteenth century had a similar effect.

Every improvement in agricultural industry, instead of keeping men on the farm, has tended to drive them from it. Scientific agriculture carried on with modern machinery necessarily lessens the need of employing a great proportion of the population to produce the foodstuffs and other raw materials which the world needs. Hence it has tended to free men from the soil and to make it possible for a larger and larger number to go to the city. Therefore the relatively diminishing importance of agriculture has been one of the prime causes of the growth of the cities in the nineteenth century; and so far as we can see this cause will continue to operate for some time to come.

2. *The Growth and Centralization of Manufacturing Industries* constitute perhaps the most vital cause of the growth of cities. The great city, as we have already seen, is very largely the product of modern industrialism. Improved machinery, improved transportation, and enlarged markets, together with the increased wants of men, not only have made possible a great growth of manufacturing industries, but also these same factors have tended to centralize manufacturing industries in the cities. Let us note briefly why it is that manufacturing industries are grouped together in great cities rather than scattered throughout the rural communities. In centralizing manufacturing plants in cities, certain industrial economies are secured, such as: (1) economy in motor power, whether it be water or coal; (2) economy in machinery—it is not necessary to duplicate machines; (3) economy in wages—one superintendent, for example, can oversee a large plant; (4) utilization of by-products—when many factories are grouped together, by-products, which are sometimes more valuable than the main products, can be better utilized. (5) There is economy in buying raw material and in selling finished products when many factories are grouped together. For all these reasons, along with the further reason that those who labor in factories must live close to them, manufacturing has been a prime cause of the modern city, and, so far as we can see, will continue further to urbanize our population in the future.

3. *The Increase of Trade and Commerce.* Between different communities there developed during the nineteenth century, upon the growth of better transportation, a great increase of trade and commerce, for along with the better transportation went a specialization in industry, on the part of both communities and classes. The modern city is often largely a product of modern transportation. We find all the great cities located at natural breaks in transportation. The cities of the Middle Ages were largely centers of trade and commerce where goods were distributed to various minor centers. The modern city has not lost this characteristic through developing into an industrial center. On the contrary, the status of the city in trade and commerce makes it at the same time a valuable center for the development of manufacturing industries. The break between land and water transportation is particularly favorable to the development of large cities. Thus, we find New York located where goods shipped to Europe must be transferred from land to water transportation; Chicago, located at a head of water transportation of the Great Lakes; St. Louis, at a head of the navigation of the Mississippi River. Only a few of the great cities of the United States in 1940 were not located on a river or some other navigable water.

This brief discussion of the general causes of the growth of cities shows in the clearest possible manner the tremendous importance of economic conditions in our civilization. We have seen that our civilization is especially characterized by a tendency to the predominance of the urban over the rural. We have also seen that the great general causes of this tendency are undoubtedly economic. However, when we have acknowledged that general economic conditions have shaped the main outline of our civilization, that is certainly as far as we are warranted in going. The existing social problems of both the city and the rural districts are certainly dependent upon many other factors than the economic. Moreover, the growth of cities has been influenced also by certain minor factors which deserve mention, though they are in large measure the outcome or the reflex of the general causes above discussed. Let us note six of them:

Minor Causes of the Growth of Cities. (1) The first of these minor causes is the better wages and better economic opportunities which cities have offered to individuals. To be sure, wages are often only nominally better in the city than in the country; but it can scarcely be doubted that with the growth of modern industry the great economic opportunities of our age have been mainly in the cities. The more ambitious elements in the country districts have not been slow to see this, and to take advantage of these opportunities. This is, of course, simply looking at the three general causes already discussed, from the standpoint of individual economic interest.

(2) A second minor cause of the growth of cities has been the superior intellectual and educational advantages which city life affords. The cities have usually had superior schools and other educational facilities, while in the country the development of these facilities has lagged behind. Circles of people with intellectual interests exist very frequently in the cities but very seldom in the country. The city pulpit has been supplied, as a rule, with the ablest ministers of every sect, while the country church has too often lacked even a resident pastor.

(3) Still another cause of the growth of the modern city has been the superior opportunities for pleasure and amusement which it affords. Such opportunities for pleasure and amusement, if they have not attracted many people to our cities, have certainly kept many people in them. Our country districts, on the other hand, have too often been deficient in opportunities for wholesome play and amusement. Lack of opportunities for sociability and reasonable recreation is one of the great deficiencies of most rural communities.

(4) The superior comforts and conveniences of city life have also attracted to our cities many who have amassed a fortune and wish to retire from active life. Until recently modern conveniences scarcely existed in country homes, and even now but few country homes can compare in their comforts and conveniences with those occupied by people of the same class in our cities.

(5) Systems of taxation have also had something to do with encouraging the growth of cities. Excepting income taxes, most

American taxes have operated unfavorably for the farmer. This is especially true of the general property tax, under which most of the personal property in cities, especially that in the form of securities, long escaped taxation. On the other hand, the general property tax falls most heavily upon the farmer because his personal property is of such a character that it rarely escapes the assessor's notice.

(6) As a last minor cause of the growth of cities let us consider the ambition and restlessness of the rural population which has sprung from our present system of education. Our rural education has been until recently almost entirely of an intellectual character, but poorly fitted to adjust the individual to rural life. Moreover, it has so emphasized individual success as to give rise to unwise ambitions and unreasonable discontent in many individuals. The education of farmers' sons and daughters has frequently resulted, therefore, in their removal from the country to the city.

Social and Moral Conditions of City Life.—Certain social conditions in our cities are worthy of attention in order that we may understand the effect of the city upon social and racial evolution.

1. *City Populations have a Larger per cent of Females than Rural Populations.* While in the country as a whole the male population exceeded the female in 1940 by 453,900, in the cities the female population exceeded the male by 1,582,820. The percentage of males in the country as a whole was 50.3, of females 49.7; while in the cities the percentage of males was 48.9, and of females 51.1. Many of our larger cities show an excess of females in their population. Thus New York city showed an excess of 102,000 in 1940, Philadelphia an excess of 46,000, St. Louis an excess of 32,000. Where cities do not have an excess of females, it is frequently due to the locating of male immigrants there. The chief cause of this excess of females in cities is to be found in the fact that in cities there are many more economic opportunities for women than in the rural districts. Other causes are the larger infantile mortality among males than among females in cities, and the larger proportion of female children born in cities than in the rural districts.

2. *People in the Active Period of Life, from Fifteen to Sixty-five Years of Age, Predominate in the City.* In 1940, out of every 100 individuals in the United States as a whole there were 23.2 under fourteen years of age, 69.9 between fourteen and sixty-five, and 6.9 above sixty-five years of age. But out of every 100 in the cities there were only 20.0 under fourteen years of age, and 6.5 above sixty-five years of age, while 73.5 were between fourteen and sixty-five years. On the other hand, in the rural farm districts there were 29.3 out of every 100 under fourteen years, 6.5 over sixty-five, while there were only 64.1 between fourteen and sixty-five. The cause of the predominance, in the cities, of those in the active period of life is undoubtedly due to the immigration into the cities from the country districts. This makes the life of cities more energetic and active, more strenuous than it would otherwise be.

3. *The Great Cities in the United States have a Much Larger Proportion of Foreign-Born in Their Population than do the Rural Districts.* This has already been discussed under the head of immigration. In 1930 over 80 per cent of all the foreign-born in the United States lived in cities.

4. *The Crude Birth Rate is Higher in American Cities than in the Rural Districts.* In 1940 the crude birth rate for cities in the United States above 10,000 was 19.7, while for rural districts it was 16.8, and 17.9 for the country as a whole. This is primarily due to there being more women of child-bearing age in American cities, and also to the presence of many foreign-born. If allowance is made for the fact that American cities have an undue proportion of adults, especially women, of reproductive age and many recent immigrants, then the corrected birth rate of our cities is much lower than the rural birth rate. In fact, the "net reproduction rate" of our rural farm districts is almost twice as high as that of our urban population. Ten adults in our larger cities are now raising only seven children, while in the farm population ten adults are raising an average of fourteen children. In other words, many of our great cities would decrease in population if it were not for migration into them from rural regions.

5. *The Death Rate in Cities is also Higher than in the Rural Districts.* In 1940 the crude death rate in the rural districts of the United States was 10.3, while in the urban districts it was 11.3. The real death rate of cities is, however, much higher than the crude statistics indicate. If we allowed for the rapid growth of many of our cities by migration into them of persons in the prime of life, the comparison would be still more unfavorable to the cities. The high death rate of cities is undoubtedly due to the poor sanitary and living conditions of the larger cities.

6. *The Physical Condition of City Populations.* Measurements by Dr. Beddoe and others show that the stature and other measurements of men of the great cities of Great Britain are far below those of the rural population. The latest English commission to investigate the conditions of city life also reports that the population of the British cities at least shows marked signs of physical deterioration.

Poverty, overcrowding, lack of sunlight, insufficient nourishment, bad sanitation, bad housing, and indoor work make many diseases more prevalent in cities than in the country. Particularly is this true of tuberculosis, syphilis, and nervous diseases.

7. *Evidences of Social Degeneracy in our Cities.* (1) Mental diseases have become one of the chief manifestations of individual and social maladjustment in our civilization. Over 500,000 cases of mental disease were treated in our hospitals in 1940, occupying more than half of all the hospital beds. Careful study of these cases shows that since 1910 our urban communities contribute nearly twice as many cases of mental disease as do our rural communities. This is good evidence of the difficulties which some elements of our population find in adjusting themselves to the complexity and strenuosity of urban life. Even after allowance is made for the presence in American cities of foreign-born, Negroes, and other unstable elements, there seems to be little doubt about the connection between urbanism and mental disorders.

(2) Suicide is one of the most striking expressions of social maladjustment. Whenever social bonds are weakened by the decay of the

family and religion, by the prevalence of poverty, vice, and crime, suicide increases. Social control over individual behavior in the great city is usually weakened on account of its impersonal character. Moreover, the anonymity and solitude of the great city lessens social control. For these and other reasons the cities of both Europe and America show suicide rates from 50 to 80 per cent higher than their surrounding rural areas.

(3) Crime has often characterized rural districts in the United States, especially on the frontier. But crime has come to center more and more in our cities. It is here that racketeering, gangsterdom, and commercialized vice have created their "underworlds." Careful research has shown that in some of our great cities large districts are often so productive of crime that they have been called "delinquency areas." Usually serious crimes, such as homicide, burglary, and robbery, in the United States are nearly twice as numerous in our great cities as in their surrounding country districts. Apart from Southern cities with a large Negro population, the United States census shows the homicide rate of our great cities, for example, to be nearly twice that of rural farm areas.

Here should be mentioned the prevalence of juvenile delinquency in most of our cities. As has often been well said, our cities were built for adults rather than for children. Most cities present a very inadequate and often demoralizing social environment for the child to grow up in. There is not only lack of play space and fresh air and sunlight, but there are slums and unwholesome neighborhoods. Juvenile delinquency is significant for social maladjustment because all study of crime shows that the adult criminal usually develops from the juvenile delinquent.

(4) Vice centers largely in our cities. Prostitution, gambling, and drink, along with organized crime, are what produce "the underworld." Our cities with their political corruption, their family and community disorganization, their ignorant and often vicious personal leadership, are responsible for this supreme manifestation of social maladjustment.

(5) Poverty and dependency are not only most manifest in the city, but to a large extent have been fostered by the conditions of city life. "Slums," unsanitary, squalid districts with bad housing, have produced the most hideous forms of social disorganization and deterioration found in our civilization. These have been breeding places for all the forms of social degeneracy which have just been discussed. Careful research again has shown the territorial relationship between such poverty and many other forms of social maladjustment.

Moreover, business depressions and industrial unemployment in city populations more often result in permanent economic distress and dependency of the persons so affected than in farm populations. City populations are particularly dependent upon general industrial prosperity. City poverty is generally more helpless and socially demoralizing than rural poverty.

When we consider all these evidences of social maladjustment in city life, it seems that modern civilization, through neglecting such maladjustments, has been preparing and promoting its own destruction. But there is no reason to think that they cannot be remedied by the application of scientific social knowledge. Indeed, enough has already been accomplished in lessening these evils to demonstrate that, under conditions of peace and co-operation, they are subject to scientific control.

8. *Educational and Religious Conditions in Cities.* We now come to the more hopeful side of our picture of urban life. We have already seen that illiteracy among the native white population is much less in our cities than in the rural districts. This is undoubtedly due in the main to the better facilities for education in our cities, and it is here chiefly that we find the bright side of city life; for the cities are not only centers of the evil tendencies of our civilization, but are also the centers of all that is best and uplifting. The urban schools in general are open much longer than rural schools, the attendance in them is better, and the teaching is much more efficient. In 1930 the urban schools held 184.5 days in the year, while the rural schools held only 160.6 days. The attendance in the urban schools was 84.4 per cent of

the enrollment, while in the rural schools it was only 81.3 per cent. Besides the schools, of course, must be mentioned many other educational facilities to be found in our cities, such as those in connection with social settlements, lecture and concert halls, theaters, libraries, art galleries, and museums,—all of which, practically, are found only in the city.

The Census Bureau in 1926 took a religious census, and it seemed to show that on the whole religious conditions were better in our cities than in the country districts. In cities the church membership was 51 per cent of the population, while it was only 36.7 per cent of the rural population. Again, in cities above 25,000 it was 54.8 per cent of their total population, while in the four largest cities—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit—it was 55.2 per cent of their total population. Some other studies, however, while not extensive enough to justify a conclusion, seem to indicate that in some of the largest cities the church is losing its hold, and that more and more the population of our largest urban centers is becoming churchless, if not without religion. Even if this is so, however, it also remains a fact that the various religious denominations put forth their best efforts in these largest urban centers, and that more is being done for the people religiously and morally in these centers than perhaps for any other portion of the world's population.

Finally, it must be noted that social welfare activities center largely in our cities. Most of the agencies of remedial and preventive philanthropy, such as charity organization societies, hospitals, and social settlements are still to be found only in the city. Therefore, very much more is done for city populations to prevent or to overcome social maladjustment than is done for rural populations.

The Reconstruction of Our City Life.—The proposals for dealing with the evils of city life illustrate the foolish and the wise methods of dealing with social problems. The foolish method is to try to get away from the problem. The wise method is to meet the problem by fuller and more intelligent control of the social situation. Of the six

methods to be discussed here for dealing with the evils of city life, the first four would try to check the growth of cities, and so avoid the problem; while the last two, recognizing that the cities are here to stay, would reconstruct city life through scientific control over its conditions.

(1) The first method is to make agriculture more attractive and remunerative. This is a good thing in itself, but, as we have seen, it will not check the growth of the cities; rather, every improvement in the conditions of agriculture in the way of making it more productive and remunerative will drive more to the cities.

(2) A second method, akin to the first, is to make village life more attractive. Like the first method, this is good in itself, but it is hardly probable that it will stop the growth of cities; rather, it might be urged that village improvement will give people a taste of the higher comforts and conveniences to be found in cities and will tend to send them to the city.

(3) The third proposed method is to remove the poor of the cities to the country. This is the so-called "back to the land" movement, which has recently been advocated, especially by some leaders in agriculture. This plan, however, while it may benefit individuals, cannot do much toward helping to solve the problem of the city. It is a difficult thing to get any large number of the poor in the city adjusted again to rural life, and the probability is that in many cases they would be worse off in the country than in the city. Moreover, the vacant places they left would soon be filled by others, and in general the whole plan seems to be against human nature as well as against the social forces of the time.

(4) Administrative decentralization may be mentioned as a plan adopted by some state legislatures to prevent the growth of cities, that is, to scatter the state institutions through the rural sections of the state instead of locating them in the cities. On the whole, this is a foolish plan. The cities will not be checked in their growth by this, while on the other hand it is the cities which most need the presence of the state institutions.

(5) The most important remedy for the cure of the evils of the cities, and one which meets these evils on their own ground, is scientific social control, including scientific city planning; that is, the supervision and control by the city of all the things which are used in common by the people. The idea is that the city is not in its social conditions comparable to the rural community; rather it is more like one big household, and it is necessary, therefore, that there be collective housekeeping, so to speak, in order to keep those things which the people use in common at least in good order. This has often been called "municipal socialism." It is not socialism, however, in the strict sense, for it does not advocate the ownership in common of all capital, but rather municipal control of public utilities. Upon this large subject many books have been written; to a few of these the student will find references at the end of this chapter. Here it is only necessary to note that all of this civic improvement implies that the city must own or control adequately its sewer system, its water supply, its streets; that it must control the housing of the people, the disposal of garbage, the smoke nuisance, general sanitary and living conditions; that it must provide adequate protection against fire, an adequate park system, an adequate free school system, with public playgrounds for children, free libraries, free art galleries and museums, municipal theaters, public baths, and gymnasiums.

But the city should do even more than this in its collective capacity. It should also control the moral conditions under which the people live. It should provide wholesome public recreations and amusements, inspect and censor commercial amusements. It should see to it that conditions favorable to moral and social welfare are everywhere preserved for all classes. Vice and lawlessness must be sternly repressed if city life is not to breed disorder and degeneration. Boards of Public Welfare, Community Councils, and the like in many cities have furnished fine examples of what cities can do to meet the higher social and moral needs of their people.

All of this is of course a species of socialism in the sense that it is collective control of the conditions of living together. It advocates,

however, that the city should control only those things that are used in common. The trouble with this so-called municipal socialism is that it presupposes a pretty high degree of intelligence on the part of the people. Whether or not a municipality shall own and operate its own street railways and electric light and gas plants, is largely a question of the development of the social consciousness and intelligence in that particular community. In some communities such municipal undertakings have been made a success; in others they have failed. But it is evident that with a large mass of people living together the common conditions of living must be subject to intelligent collective control if human life and character are to have a proper environment in which to develop.

(6) The last remedy proposed for the maladjustments which have accompanied the growth of cities is the decentralization of population and industry by means of modern transportation. This is already being rapidly accomplished in many of our large cities. Suburbs and "satellite cities" are developing rapidly in most "metropolitan districts." However, transportation must be made cheap if it is going to enable working men to live at a distance from their labor.

There is no doubt that the solution of the mechanical problem of rapid and cheap transportation will tend to relieve automatically the present congestion which we find in many of our great cities. The trouble with this remedy for urban maladjustments is that when too much reliance is placed upon it, it makes the problem too easy, since it overlooks the social and moral factors which have just been discussed. Suburbs and satellite cities are not always model places in which to live. Scientific city planning, with its "zoning," adds beauty and convenience to any city; but it scarcely touches the social maladjustments which make cities a problem in our civilization. Stringent regulation of all living conditions by law, backed up by enlightened civic conscience, is necessary to put order and healthfulness into that vast household which we call a great city.

Summary and Conclusion.—Gist and Halbert, in their careful study of *Urban Society*, rightly say: "The city is a recent arrival in the

world of man-made things. Consequently when urbanism burst upon the world in all its vigor it found neither the human organism nor the social organization ready to meet its demands . . . Whether mankind has built a monster that will in the end destroy him only the future can tell."

We should note carefully that the era of the city is just beginning; that a larger and larger proportion of our population will come to live under the urban pattern of life, and that, therefore, the city will dominate the society of the future. Hence, humanity must solve the problem of the city if social progress is to continue. And the problem is by no means insoluble. Man is not yet adjusted to city life. The city is so new even to civilized man that he has carried into it the habits which he practiced in isolated rural communities. These are the sources of trouble in our cities, and, as we have already seen, new adjustments have to be made by individuals in order to secure harmonious social relationships under the crowded conditions of the city. The city requires, therefore, a higher degree of intelligence on the part of the individual than the rural social life, and a great part of the solution of the problem of the city must come through the development of such higher intelligence and morality by means of education. At any rate, it is foolish to decry the city or to attempt to stop its growth. That is impossible and, probably, undesirable. The ideal social life of man has never been the isolated life of the rural community. The city has always been in a sense man's ideal, as is shown by the fact that nearly all attempts to depict a perfect human society have been pictures of cities. Man's ideal, as Dr. Weber says, is not the city or the country, but the city and the country blended.

This is the "rurban" community, which many sociologists find even now in a process of development; and this is what the city of the future should become. No doubt the time will come when present cities will be looked back upon with horror, as we look back on eighteenth-century cities. The city of the future need not present any of the hideous, disagreeable, and unwholesome aspects of our present cities. They have been, perhaps not altogether unjustly,

characterized as "monuments of human greed." Their condition has been due, however, not so much to the deliberate selfishness of individuals, as to ignorance, wrong laws, wrong industrial conditions, wrong systems of taxation, of party politics, and of city government, along of course with our commercialized "mores." There is much, however, in the greater solidarity and intensity of social life in the city which contains the promise of a higher social life for mankind, once the problems of city life are understood and mastered. Through scientific control over the conditions of life, it is possible that the city can be made a place in which human beings may find their ideal society.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ANDERSON, N., and LINDEMAN, E. C., *Urban Sociology*, Chaps. III-V.

CARPENTER, N., *The Sociology of City Life*, Chaps. I, V, VIII-X.

GILLETTE, J. M., and REINHARDT, J. M., *Problems of a Changing Social Order*, Chap. 11.

THOMPSON, W. S., *Population Problems*, 3d Ed., Chaps. XVI–XIX.

For more extended reading:

DAVIE, M. R., *Problems of City Life.*

FORD, J., *Slums and Housing.*

GEDDES, P., *Cities in Evolution.*

GIST, N. P., and HALBERT, L. A., *Urban Society*, Rev. Ed.

LYND, R. S., and LYND, H. M., *Middletown.*

MUMFORD, L., *The Culture of Cities.*

MUNTZ, E. E., *Urban Sociology.*

PARK, R. E., and BURGESS, E. W., *The City.*

QUEEN, S. A., and THOMAS, L. F., *The City: A Study of Urbanism in the United States.*

SOROKIN, P. A., and ZIMMERMAN, C. C., *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology.*

THOMPSON, J. G., *Urbanization*, Chaps. I-II.

WEBER, A. F., *The Growth of Cities in Nineteenth Century.*

WOOLSTON, H. B., *Metropolis, A Study of Urban Communities.*
Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What has produced the modern city and its problems?
2. How is the modern city like or different from the ancient city?
3. What are the facts concerning the growth of cities in the United States? Have these their parallel in nations of western Europe? Why?
4. What have been the great social causes of the growth of cities?
5. What have been the minor or individual causes? Have the preferences of individuals for city life been the real causes of the growth of cities?
6. If the main causes of the growth of cities are the economic forces of our civilization, does it follow that the problem of the city is essentially economic? Why, or why not?
7. What are some of the peculiarities of the make-up of city populations? Why?
8. What evidences of social maladjustment do we find in the statistics of city populations? Why do we find these?
9. In general, which is better—to try to escape from social evils, or to meet them on their own ground by superior control of conditions?
10. Outline a system of social control, or of "improved municipal housekeeping," adequately to remedy the evils of present city life.

For classroom discussion:

1. Is "urbanization" a result of the growth of population, or of our machine civilization? Give evidence for your answer.
2. Is urbanization greater in the United States or in Europe? Give comparative figures.
3. What evidence is there that city populations are not well adjusted, biologically and socially?
4. Why does the city need a different system of social control than rural communities?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Is the solution of city problems essentially a matter of engineering?

CHAPTER XIII

THE RURAL PROBLEM

THE reflex of the city problem is the rural problem. The urbanization of our civilization has, as we have seen, produced tendencies which threaten to destroy the most fundamental social values by which men have lived since the Stone Age. Until recently human society has been made up predominantly of rural dwellers who followed in the main in their social behavior the patterns evolved by the rural family and the rural neighborhood. Down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, probably ninety per cent of mankind lived under essentially rural conditions. But all this, as we have already seen, is rapidly changing in the nations which are most advanced in modern civilization. We have also seen that it is as yet uncertain whether the masses of mankind can successfully adjust themselves to the conditions in great cities and remain sound and wholesome in their physical, mental, and social life. Therefore, the question of the present social condition, and of the future prospects, of those who continue to live in our rural communities becomes a problem of vital importance.

The Development of the Rural Community.—The rural community, as we understand it, originated in, and is based upon, agriculture. Agriculture, the cultivation of plants and animals for an artificial food supply, must be counted the greatest of man's inventions; for it enabled man to free himself from the limitations of a purely natural food supply, to multiply his numbers, and to found not merely local communities, but great states. It became the basis of all subsequent culture, even of our own machine civilization. Agriculture probably began first in the Nile and Tigris-Euphrates valleys about ten thousand years ago. In the beginning this agriculture was "hoe agriculture," or gardening; and it was not until about two thousand years

later that the plow, drawn by some domesticated animal, was invented. The plow became the true basis of extensive agriculture, or farming, as distinguished from gardening, and more definitely established the settled agricultural community. The pattern of settled agriculture, or farming, spread from its oriental homelands, and five or six thousand years ago became widespread in Europe. From that time land became the most important form of property, and land ownership a powerful factor in human relations. All the values and traditions connected with the private family and the rural neighborhood began to emerge and take shape.

In the meantime the nomadic peoples of Asia and Europe took up the breeding and grazing of herds of domestic animals. This "imperfect agriculture" encouraged nomadism, instead of leading to settled agricultural life, since grazing, or pastoral industry, requires immense stretches of pasture for the feeding of flocks. The nomads frequently attacked and plundered the settled agriculturalists. The latter for protection had grouped themselves in villages.[1] Hence there developed, over practically all Europe, many agricultural or "peasant" villages which still remain. But often later these villages were conquered by nomads who established themselves as "lords," while the peasants became serfs.

Thus agriculture, like all of man's material inventions which have given him power over nature, resulted in both good and bad social effects. On the one hand, it gave rise to all of the peaceful arts connected with food supply, clothing, shelter, and settled family and community life. But on the other hand, it was a main stimulus to the development, among other evils, of war, slavery, and despotic government. The lords of the villages, or "manors," became the landed aristocracy of most European states. This relation of "lord" and "peasant" furnished later the pattern for the political and economic relations of the "landlord" and "tenant" classes. These patterns have been fundamentally changed in most European nations only since the beginning of the twentieth century.

[1]Living in villages for protection, however, began in the hunting and fishing stage.

The Development of Agriculture in the United States. In the main these European patterns for rural community life were brought to the United States by the early settlers, but with modifications. Among the most important of these was the isolated farmstead. While the New England settlers developed the agricultural village, as also did some of the Dutch and Spanish settlers, the immense amount of free land led naturally to the development, as the pioneer settlers moved westward, of relatively isolated homesteads and farms. The Virginia gentry, however, brought with them the pattern of the English manor, which developed into the plantation pattern in the Southern states. This development was furthered by the granting of considerable tracts of land in Virginia and other Southern colonies to prominent settlers who had capital. The English manorial system with Negro slavery seemed to these settlers the only way to make their "plantations" financially profitable. As the planter class had wealth and social prestige, they came to dominate in the Southern states politically and economically as well as socially.

In the meantime pioneer settlers from the peasantry of western Europe were pouring into the South and the West, mainly through Pennsylvania, seeking homes, and as a rule establishing individual farmsteads. These settlers came not so much to seek their fortune as to secure a livelihood. Thus two systems of agriculture grew up in the United States—one large-scale, exploitative, aiming at financial profit; the other consisting of small holdings whose owners generally sought only a fair livelihood for their families.

During the Civil War the Homestead Act was passed by Congress, giving 160 acres of United States government land to each citizen who would settle upon it and make his home there. This law, together with the work of the surveyors of government lands, may be said to have definitely established the typical American pattern for rural communities of separate, or isolated, homes and farms. In the South, at the same time, the Civil War greatly modified the plantation system. After the war many plantations were broken up into small holdings which were rented either to cash-paying tenants or to "share crop-

pers" who could furnish practically nothing except their labor. The cropper system was designed to take care of the emancipated Negro slaves, who as tenants usually had nothing to offer except their labor—implements and live stock being furnished by the owner of the land; but soon the poorer class of white agricultural laborers also availed themselves of the system. Thus the South came to have three principal agricultural classes—landowners, cash tenants, and "share croppers;" but of course between these main classes are various intermediate classes.

This historical background is necessary for the proper understanding of the present rural problem in the United States. But it would be a mistake to think of the rural problem as merely a development of these historical or traditional factors. It is even more a result of the mechanization and urbanization of our culture. The impact of power machines, of improved methods of transportation and communication, has shattered the old bases of rural community life.

Moreover, it would be a great mistake to consider the rural problem either in its origin or in its present development as mainly economic. It originated through the development of physical science and of machine civilization; and the present problem is not how to make agricultural communities more prosperous economically, or to secure the farmer a more equitable share of the nation's income, but how to preserve the fundamental values of the farm home and farm community. The economic conditions of rural life are important as a basis for doing this, but deeper problems are involved. We have seen that urbanization threatens the fundamental values of the family and community life. The rural sociological problem is, Can the social values of the farm home and community be preserved?

Present Rural Conditions in the United States.—We have already seen that the rural problem in the United States is very largely a reflex of the industrial revolution with its resulting urbanization of population. In the preceding chapter the emigration from the farm to the city was pointed out as a central feature of our civilization. While this movement was slowed down by the depression of the

1930's, it is probable that this effect is only temporary; for the strictly rural, or farm, population of the United States increased only from 30,157,000 in 1930 to 30,216,000 in 1940, or less than 0.2 per cent. Twenty states out of the forty-eight lost small percentages from their rural farm population, including such great agricultural states as Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. The per cent of gain of farm population in the other states was very small.

The trend in farm population, however, can best be seen when we consider occupational statistics. A little over one hundred years ago, in 1840, nearly 70 per cent of all our workers were engaged in agriculture; but in 1940 only 17.6 per cent. The largest farm population and the largest absolute number engaged in agriculture were reached in 1910, when 11,591,000 workers reported themselves so engaged in the Federal census of that year. But this number had declined by 1940 to 9,162,000 engaged in agricultural pursuits—a number far surpassed by the workers in manufacturing industry. The number of farm families, moreover, had fallen to a little over 6,000,000 in a total of nearly 35,000,000 families in our population.

The student should not be confused by the census including in our total rural population of 57,245,000 a "non-farm" population of about 27,000,000. These are persons not engaged in agriculture who live in country villages, trade centers, and unincorporated suburban areas. Probably about half of them live under rural conditions, but many, such as the suburbanites of our metropolitan districts, should be counted with our urban population. It is the family on the farm which is the particular concern of this chapter.

The Specialization and Mechanization of Agriculture. The specialization of agriculture is one of the important factors at work in producing present rural conditions. Once agriculture, as we have already seen, was an all-embracing occupation, producing nearly all kinds of consumption goods on the farm. The isolated farmstead under these conditions was nearly self-sufficient. Now agriculture has become a specialized industry, largely limited to producing raw materials for food and clothing. The raw materials produced on the farm have to be

marketed to furnish income to the farm family to buy needed consumption goods. Thus the farmer is dependent, on the one hand, on scientific knowledge to produce his crops, and on the other, on a knowledge of markets and business conditions to secure a financial reward for his labor. The modern farmer has to be a "book-farmer" if he would be successful as a producer, and also has to know the economic conditions of his world if he would be financially successful.

Equally important in its reactions on rural conditions is the mechanization of agriculture. Our machine civilization has invaded agriculture and made the farmer increasingly dependent on machines. This has necessitated knowledge and skill in handling machines on the part of farm labor and at the same time has greatly reduced the amount of labor necessary for agricultural production. This has already been illustrated in the preceding chapter, but another illustration may be given here. If the cotton-picking machine is perfected and widely adopted in the South, it is estimated that it will throw a million hand laborers out of employment. How to find other employment for the Negroes and poorer whites who have performed this labor by hand becomes another problem. Probably a certain amount of rural unemployment inevitably accompanies such technological progress. It is at the same time a prime stimulus to the rural laborer to migrate to the city.

What has been said above implies that modern farming requires considerable capital to be successful. Here the most momentous problem connected with rural programs arises. Shall agriculture be made merely another capitalistic industry, with an adequate income for the farm population as its chief end? Or, should rural programs have as their chief end the establishment of successful rural homes with adequate income regarded as important because it is a necessary instrument to achieve this purpose? In the history of American agriculture both views have played a part and have often been in conflict with each other. Some farmers have aimed chiefly at establishing a home, regarding income merely as a means to this end. Other

farmers have regarded farming primarily as a business, and have made financial income the chief end of farming.

If we regard farming chiefly as a business, there are many difficulties in the way of such a business with a system of independent farms. In the United States alone there are over 6,000,000 operators and managers of farms. It is obviously impossible to unify and co-ordinate for financial success, a business with 6,000,000 different managers in all stages of personal development and efficiency.

It is for this reason that some serious students of the farm problem see no solution except collective farming under expert bureaucratic control. But to that solution there are all of the objections which may be made to socialism. These objections in principle will be considered later; but here it may be pointed out that if the primary groups of the family and the neighborhood are as important in the socialization of the individual and the development of civilization as was shown in Chapter IV, society should preserve the integrity and the independence of the farm home, and accordingly diffuse as widely as possible in the rural population the benefits of farm ownership.

Farm Tenancy. Under the chaotic conditions of the modern world, however, stable farm ownership in the farm population is apparently becoming more and more difficult of realization. In 1880 in the United States 25 per cent of all farmers were tenants, and in 1935, 42 per cent were. In other words the proportion of farm tenants has greatly increased. A half century ago, about one farmer out of every four was a tenant; today no doubt at least two out of five are tenants. A tenant is one who rents a farm, paying his rental either in cash or in a share of the crops. The cash tenant usually has some capital, such as livestock and farm implements; but the share tenant, especially in the South, often has none—he furnishes only his labor, while the owner of the land furnishes all the capital.

It is often said that tenancy is the sign of a prosperous agriculture. But the whole history of tenancy in Western civilization would hardly confirm this optimistic conclusion. More often it has been the sign of a decaying rural life. That it has little relation to agricultural

prosperity is shown by the fact that tenancy in the United States is most common in the South, where rural communities are on the whole least prosperous. Moreover, tenancy has been in many countries of the Old World one of the most serious social problems, becoming the basis for many evils. There is every reason, therefore, for those who are concerned with the welfare of rural communities to view with apprehension the growth of farm tenancy in the United States.

The belief that tenancy is a ladder which affords the farm laborer the opportunity to become a farm owner is also fallacious. This is true only if agriculture is prosperous and farm land relatively abundant. If agriculture gives little financial return, tenancy, especially in its lower forms, gives no such opportunity. The average income for the American farm family in 1929, usually considered a prosperous year, is estimated to have been $1240. But the same year the average income of the share cropper's family in the South was under $300, a sum utterly inadequate for a decent standard of living, to say nothing of accumulating savings for farm ownership. The share croppers in the South in 1935 numbered 348,000 white families and 365,000 colored families. Originally designed, as we have seen, for the emancipated Negro slaves, share cropping has now come in the South, on account of the smaller size of the Negro family, to affect a larger white than colored population.

Farm tenancy, however, in spite of its prevalence in its worst forms in the South, is a national rather than a Southern problem. In 1935, while in seven Southern states, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and South Carolina, over 60 per cent of all farmers were tenants, in five states of the Central West, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, over 40 per cent were tenants. Two of these states, Illinois and Iowa, are usually considered exceptionally prosperous agricultural states.

But even under prosperity, farm tenancy is objectionable from the standpoint of rural community welfare. In the *first* place, under American conditions it fails to give stability to the rural community.

In the United States nearly one half of the farm tenants have been found by the census to have been on their farms less than two years; and apparently the white tenants are slightly more unstable than colored tenants. In the *second* place, under usual conditions in the United States, rural institutions, especially the church and the school, have less chance for normal development under tenancy, both on account of the extreme mobility of the tenant class just mentioned, and on account of their generally lower standard of living. For example, studies of some communities have shown that tenants as a class are from 30 to 50 per cent less likely than farm owners to be church members. It is hardly necessary to add that the normal development of family life and neighborhood life are adversely affected by tenancy. In the *third* place the material life of the rural community is rarely built up by tenancy under American conditions. Farm houses and buildings are usually in bad repair on tenant farms. Many tenants, as has often been said, "mine," rather than "farm," their land. The result is that the soil becomes eroded and depleted of its fertility. *Lastly*, because tenancy is frequently an outcome of the migration to the city of the more prosperous and ambitious elements of rural communities, the growth of tenancy is accompanied by a loss of leadership in rural communities.

For these reasons it is best to conclude with Henry Wallace: "It will be virtually impossible for America to develop a rural civilization which affords security, opportunity, and a fully abundant life for our rural people unless she acts to convert tenants into owner farmers."

The General Culture of American Rural Communities. While the basic traditions of a culture are probably best preserved in its rural communities, yet it is true that our education, science, art, finance, and medicine have been dominantly urban. While the formal education of our schools has been concerned with all the arts and sciences of urban life and culture, the basic art of our civilization, agriculture, has been left until recently to the informal education given by the farm family and the rural community. Perhaps something might be said for this informal rural education about two generations ago. It

did effectively preserve basic traditions, but it made the rural population traditionally minded, often unduly conservative, and in some cases primitive, in its methods of living. Hence many rural communities even in the United States have been very unprogressive.

But conditions have changed. The American rural community now lives in a dynamic world, and traditionalism is a poor guide to solve problems of social adjustment in such a world. Scientific guidance is now almost as necessary in rural life as in urban life. It is now generally recognized that we must have an education for rural life in our country schools if we are to solve problems of rural maladjustment. This must be, first of all, an education for citizenship in rural communities, and then an education in country high schools in the basic arts of rural living. Until recently such education has been in a large part of the United States almost nonexistent for the rural population. This is not to be wondered at, because such education in its more technical aspects is expensive. Perhaps the more technical agricultural arts will always have to be taught by apprenticeship; but it has now been amply demonstrated that the fundamental patterns of rural life can be taught in the schools, and only financial resources and qualified teachers are necessary to carry out such a program.

It is not only the rural church and the rural school that have lagged behind in their development to meet rural needs, but practically all other rural welfare agencies. There is space here for only a single illustration. Until recently hospitals in country districts for country people were almost unknown. Such hospitals are almost entirely the creation of the present generation, and are still inadequate for the rural population, as is indeed medical service in country districts in general. While the health of country people has in general been better than the health of city people, yet there are many diseases endemic in our rural population, especially in our South, such as hookworm and malaria. Evidently health and sanitation need scientific attention in rural not less than in urban communities.

Here it should be remembered that the descendants of our present rural population are going to furnish the bulk of our people in the

future. Still in 1940 the "net reproduction rate" of families on the farm in the United States was nearly twice as high as the "net reproduction rate" of urban families. Farm families seem destined to furnish the population of the future, and this means that too much cannot be done for the rural children, not only for their health and personal education, but also for the improvement of their social environment. The ambitious youth of rural communities must find in rural life ample opportunities for service and development. In other words, we need a worthy and wholesome rural civilization to balance our urban civilization. Then the two can blend and form one integrated culture with benefits to both.

Proposed Programs for the Rehabilitation of Rural Life.—(1) *Government Subsidies to Farmers.* Government subsidies to agriculture in one form or another, direct or indirect, have been resorted to in many countries. If they are merely temporary measures to tide over some crisis, or to initiate some new co-operative undertaking, there is perhaps little objection to them. But permanent subsidies to any social or economic class have been thoroughly discredited by careful study. Every part of a national economy should stand on its own feet. The effect of subsidy is to make one class live at the expense of other classes. Urban communities have often been accused of living through the exploitation of rural communities; but the reversal of this situation would not better conditions. Independence and self-support through productive labor are the social ideal for all economic classes and the only basis of true co-operation. They have always been the ideal of the American farmer, and it would be disastrous to our rural civilization to destroy this ideal by the unwise use of government subsidies.

(2) *The Collectivization of Agriculture.* As we have already seen, the confusion resulting from 6,000,000 different farm managers, with differing aims, methods, and intelligence in agricultural practice, has led some students to propose the abolition of private ownership and management of farms and the development of collective farming under the management of government bureaus and government experts. This, of course, is socialism, and is substantially the system adopted by

Soviet Russia. Socialists say that it is inevitable. Urban industry, they say, is destined to become communistic, and so too, sooner or later, is agriculture.

All of the objections to communism in general set forth in Chapter XVI of this text apply to this solution of the farm problem. It destroys absolutely the freedom and independence of the farm family. If the family as a primary group has flourished best in the country as a farm family, then its value as a socializing agency would be seriously undermined by communistic agriculture. Moreover, such a system would put first the economic element in rural life and could hardly be established without governmental coercion.

(3) *The Diffusion and Stabilization of Private Farm Ownership.* This program would aim at the very opposite of the socialistic plan of collective farming. Instead of abolishing the ownership and management of farms by private families, it would aim at extending and stabilizing the benefits of farm ownership. But to succeed in doing this, a general program of rural welfare would have to be initiated and carried out. The original aim of farm families to establish homes rather than to produce for the markets would have to be restored. Agricultural production would have to be primarily for use rather than for profit. The maladjustments brought about in rural life by the over-commercialization of agriculture would have to be recognized and curbed by making possible the realization by all of the values of the rural home and community. It may be reasonably argued that such a rural program is necessary for the stabilization of our whole civilization. Industrial unemployment seems to threaten the future, even more than the present, and unless a rural life which is essentially noncommercialized can be restored and maintained, the outlook for stability in our whole civilization is dark. But this program of preserving the independence and integrity of the farm family by helping farmers to own their homes and rural communities to develop their institutions, so that the rural population will find country life to be an abundant life, will fail unless certain maladjustments in our agricultural system are removed.

(4) *The Elimination of Farm Tenancy.* The first step in restoring farm ownership to the actual tillers of the soil is the practical elimination of farm tenancy as a status. It ought to be possible for every farm family by thrift and energy to own the land which it works. If tenancy is to be retained at all, it ought to be as an easy step toward farm ownership. The ownership of the land by those who work it should be aided and encouraged. This is not an impracticable program, because it has been carried out successfully by several European countries. The most tenant-ridden country of Europe was once Ireland; but today practically no farm tenancy remains in Ireland. By the practical elimination of tenancy and the initiation of various forms of co-operation among farmers, Denmark, we are told, "has been able to lift herself from bankruptcy and poverty to become the most happy and prosperous agricultural nation on the globe." Even England, once the classical land of prosperous farm tenancy, of recent years has so restricted landlords, so protected tenants in their rights, and so encouraged land purchase that it seems destined to become a country of small farms. In all of these cases government aid has been extended to tenants who wish to purchase the land they work, land prices and rents have been made subject to arbitration or judicial control, low interest rates and longtime credits have been established for the tenant-purchaser, and compensation for improvements made upon land or buildings has been assured to tenants. There is no reason why an essentially similar program to eliminate unnecessary farm tenancy cannot be initiated in the United States, even though our agricultural situation is much more complex.

(5) *Voluntary Co-operation in Rural Enterprises.* Co-operation has been the key to success in the rural programs of many European countries. Sweden, for example, has attained its enviable rural development through various voluntary co-operative movements. Not only are consumers and marketing co-operatives well organized among Swedish farmers, but in some cases producers co-operatives have been organized to combat monopolies. In all of these improvements the Swedish government has assisted, protected, and encouraged the

movement. To some extent similar developments have taken place among American farmers, but on a much less extensive scale.

In 1937 there existed among American farmers 10,752 co-operative associations with nearly two million members, for marketing farm products and purchasing supplies. They were utilized by about 17 per cent of the farm families. They were, moreover, not without government encouragement. The Federal Department of Agriculture has especially encouraged and assisted the formation of marketing co-operatives among American farmers. Voluntary planning of farm production on a large scale is, of course, another example.

It is obviously certain that these voluntary co-operative movements among farmers are entirely consistent with individual farm ownership and the freedom and independence of the farm population. Indeed, they presuppose individual farm management. They overcome its possible maladjustments by intelligent collective purposes and co-ordinated social action. It is evident, too, that the same principle of co-operation must be applied in all rural community programs if they are to succeed.

(6) *The Building of Rural Civilization.* Upon the foundation laid by farm ownership by individual families and agricultural production primarily for use rather than profit, there is needed a program for the development, in every rural community, of a rural civilization which will assure an abundant life for rural dwellers. Without such a program a worth-while and satisfying rural life can hardly be expected to exist. Now civilization can be developed and maintained only through learning civilized ways of living. All educational agencies in the broadest sense of that phrase are concerned with its development. Nor is civilization simply a matter of learning the traditions of the past. In a dynamic world new adjustments must be made to new conditions under the guidance of intelligent leaders. But it is still all a matter of learning, both individual and collective. It would seem that this process for the rural community must center in the two great educational agencies, the school and the church; and this conclusion is theoretically correct. But it must be remembered that in

practice the country school and the country church have often lagged behind in their development and are in many rural communities unduly conservative. There is abundant room, therefore, for the work of other educational agencies in the building of rural civilization, especially journalism and public discussion groups.

The Porter School near Kirksville, Missouri, was the agency which, under the leadership of a single teacher, built a progressive civilization in its district. There are many examples where rural churches and resident pastors have done the same thing. An excellent example is the work of a Roman Catholic Church and College at Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Here under the leadership of the priests of the church a community of 200,000 poor farmers and fishermen, through various co-operative enterprises, not only became prosperous, but raised the whole level of their culture. This was largely accomplished through "study clubs" conducted by the local church and college. Other agencies than schools and churches, however, in other places have done equally successful work in building rural civilization. The vital things in such work seem to be leadership and education.

The Federal government cannot be accused of neglecting the agricultural education of our farm population. In almost every county of the United States there are now county agricultural agents and home demonstration agents, supported by the Federal and State governments, to teach farm people better ways of farming and better ways of living. These are all under the control and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the Federal Department of Agriculture. They doubtless fail to reach some of our lower rural classes—wage workers, share croppers, and some cash tenants; but one could scarcely ask for a more splendid example of governmental work for social welfare. If any criticism is to be made it is that such work is too largely centered on the economic side of rural life; but government work for social welfare is almost necessarily limited to tangible, material factors. It is a natural division of labor to leave the more spiritual aspects of such work to the school and the church, which at any rate have plenty of work to do in the building of rural civilization.

Professor Lynn Smith in his volume on *The Sociology of Rural Life* concludes: "The most promising places to begin (to improve rural conditions in the United States) are with the tariff, the general property tax, the extension of public health to rural areas, the framing of a national educational policy, an extension program of adult education, and a thorough renovation of the relations of the population to the land." Such a program is only a beginning. But all of these ends involve the use of educational agencies as well as agencies of social control. Fundamentally the task is educational in the sense that a different set of values must be generally accepted by the people before we can build a better rural civilization.

Summary.—The rural problem is not insoluble. Its solution might be easily possible if thought and resources could be devoted to the problems of peace. But its solution would necessitate changes in the values of our civilization. Rural problems show us the inadequacy of such values as power and sense satisfactions to produce a wholesome and satisfying human life. The industrial revolution produced the modern city, and the growth of cities has produced the present rural problem. The problem is our whole civilization, not rural life abstracted from urban life. The fundamental principles of human living together are the same for all communities, rural or urban. Hence the solution of the rural problem must come through the building of an integrated civilization for both city and country upon sound social values.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

SIMS, N. L., *Elements of Rural Sociology*, 3d Ed., Chaps. XXV-XXVII.
SMITH, T. L., *The Sociology of Rural Life*, Chaps. I-IX.
SOROKIN, P. A., and ZIMMERMAN, C. C., *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*, Chaps. I, II.

For more extended reading:

CHILDS, M. W., *Sweden: the Middle Way.*
GALPIN, C. J., *Rural Social Problems.*

GEE, W., *The Social Economics of Agriculture.*
GILLETTE, J. M., *Rural Sociology*, Ed. 1936.
GROVES, E. R., *The Rural Mind and Social Welfare.*
HAWTHORNE, H. B., *The Sociology of Rural Life.*
HAYES, A. W., *Rural Sociology.*
HOLMES, R. H., *Rural Sociology: The Family-Farm Institution.*
HOWE, F. C., *Denmark: The Cooperative Way.*
JOHNSON, C. S., and others, *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy.*
KOLB, J. H., and BRUNNER, E. DE S., *A Study of Rural Society.*
LANDIS, P. H., *Rural Life in Process.*
ODUM, H. W., *Southern Regions of the United States.*
RAPER, A., *Preface to Peasantry.*
SANDERSON, D., *The Rural Community.*
SANDERSON, D., *Rural Sociology and Rural Social Organization.*
TAYLOR, C. C., *Rural Sociology*, Rev. Ed.
VANCE, R. B., *Regional Reconstruction: A Way Out for the South.*
WILLIAMS, J. M., *Our Rural Heritage.*
YODER, F. R., *An Introduction to Agricultural Economics.*
ZIMMERMAN, C. C., *The Changing Community.*
Farm Tenancy, Report of President's Committee, 1937.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why is the rural problem to be considered a reflex of the city problem?
2. What is the origin of the rural community?
3. Why should agriculture be considered the most important invention of mankind?
4. Sketch the history of agriculture, especially in Europe.
5. Sketch the history of agriculture in the United States.
6. What effect has our machine civilization had upon farm life?
7. How did the isolated farm and farm home come to develop in the United States?
8. Outline the present condition of American agriculture.
9. Discuss in detail the problem of farm tenancy in the United States.
10. Discuss proposed methods for the rehabilitation of our rural community life.

11. What are the measures which must be taken to produce a stable and wholesome rural civilization in the United States?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the relation of the modern rural problem to the city problem?
2. What is a rural community? Was it the primitive form of community life?
3. How did farm tenancy arise? What are its forms and what possible evils may result?
4. Should the tillers of the soil be independent owners (so far as practicable) of the land they work? Or would you favor collective farming with central management?
5. Should the rural school and the rural church concern themselves with rural community conditions?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Would the rural problem disappear if we increased adequately the income of the farmer?

CHAPTER XIV

POVERTY AND PAUPERISM

WHILE the many social problems arising from the presence in society of abnormal or socially unadjusted classes, namely, the dependent, defective, and delinquent classes, cannot be discussed in this book adequately, yet they must be briefly noticed in order to correlate them with other social problems, and even more in order to call the attention of the student to the vast literature which exists concerning these problems.

Definitions of Poverty and Pauperism.—Poverty is a relative term, difficult to define, but as generally employed in sociological writings at present it means that economic and social state in which persons have not sufficient income to maintain health and efficiency. All who do not receive a sufficient income to maintain the minimum standard of living necessary for efficiency are known as the "poor," or are said to live below the poverty line.

Pauperism, on the other hand, is the state of legal dependency in which a person who is unable or unwilling to support himself receives relief from funds raised by public taxation. This is, however, legal pauperism. The word as popularly used has come to mean a degraded state of willing dependency. A pauper in this popular sense is a person who is unwilling to support himself and who becomes a social parasite.

Poverty is closely related to dependency or pauperism, because it is frequently the anteroom, so to speak, to pauperism, although only a small proportion of those who live in poverty actually become dependent in any one year. That is to say, paupers are usually poor people who have failed in their struggle to support themselves without public aid.

The Extent of Poverty and Pauperism in the United States. It has been generally estimated that in prosperous years about five per cent of our population are recipients of some sort of charitable relief. In our large cities the number who received relief from public and private sources, in average years, has been very much higher. Five per cent would make the number who received relief in 1928, say, 6,000,000, and probably this is not an excessive estimate. Upon the basis of these and other known facts it has been estimated that the number of people in the United States living below the poverty line has been from 15 to 20 per cent in years of average prosperity. Probably this estimate understates rather than overstates the number of families in the United States who even under conditions of general prosperity have such a low standard of living that they fail to maintain physical and mental efficiency.

Investigations in the countries of Europe indicate that the estimate of fifteen per cent of our population living in poverty in normal times is far from excessive. Mr. Charles Booth, in his *Life and Labor of the People of London*, found that about thirty per cent of the population of London lived below the poverty line, and Mr. B. S. Rowntree found in the English city of York about the same proportion. While poverty has been more prevalent in the Old World than in the United States, still it has been shown that at least half of the families of the United States are practically propertyless, which again indicates that an estimate of from fifteen to twenty per cent below the poverty line is conservative.

The Brookings Institution has shown that in the prosperous year of 1929 out of 29,000,000 families in the United States, 6,000,000 had incomes under $1,000 a year, and 12,000,000 under $1,500. Moreover the National Resources Committee for the depression year of 1935–36 reported that one third of all American families had that year an income of less than $780; one half, an income of less than $1,070; and two thirds, an income of less than $1,450. It was estimated that in 1933 at the bottom of the depression, fifty per cent of our families were in poverty. While these last figures are for abnormal rather than

normal conditions, they do show that many American families live so near the poverty line that an industrial depression easily precipitates them into the destitute and dependent classes. Moreover, these conditions are not peculiar to the United States. They are found in all the larger civilized nations.

When we extend our view in history we find that poverty has been oftentimes in the past even much more prevalent than it is at present. This question of poverty is, in other words, a world-old question and is intimately bound up with the question of material civilization—that is, man's conquest of nature—and with social organization,—the relations of men to one another. At certain times in history certain institutions such as slavery have either obviated or concealed poverty, and particularly its extreme expressions in dependency and legal pauperism. Nevertheless, we can regard poverty and pauperism as practically existing in all civilizations and in all ages. This is not saying, however, that modern poverty and pauperism may not have certain peculiar foundations in modern social and industrial conditions; for such peculiar foundations are found in modern industrial depressions and in the growth of great cities which render the poor peculiarly helpless. It is only saying that it is useless to search wholly for the causes of poverty in conditions that are peculiar to the modern world, because poverty and pauperism are not peculiarly modern problems.

The Genesis of the Depressed Classes.—So complex a problem, it might be said at once, manifestly cannot have a simple explanation, yet this has been the mistake of many social thinkers of the past. They have sought some single simple explanation of human misery, and particularly in its form of economic distress or poverty. Malthus, as we have already seen, attributed all human misery to the fact that population tends to increase more rapidly than food supply, and that it is the pressure of population upon food which sufficiently explains poverty in human society. Karl Marx offered an equally sweeping explanation when he attributed all poverty to the fact that labor is not paid a sufficient wage; that the capitalist appropriates an unjust

share of the product of labor, leaving to the laborer just enough to maintain existence and reproduce. Henry George in the same spirit, in his *Progress and Poverty*, attributed all poverty to one cause,—the landlord's appropriation of the unearned increment in land values. There is, of course, some basis for all of these sweeping generalizations, but surely there is not sufficient in any of them to stand the test of concrete investigation; rather these men have made the mistake of attempting to explain a very complex social phenomenon in terms of a single set of causes, which, as we have already seen, has been the bane of social science in the past.

Even the theory of evolution itself fails to explain, as ordinarily stated, the genesis of the depressed classes in human society. It may explain it in part, however. As we have already seen, biological variations are always found in individuals, making some naturally superior, some naturally inferior, and in the struggle for existence we know that the inferior are more liable to go down; they are less apt to maintain a place in society, and hence more readily fall into the depressed classes. Many well-endowed persons, however, also fall into the dependent classes through accidents and causes inherent in our social organization but in no way natural. Thus, owing to our industrial system and to our laws of property, inheritance, and the like, it often happens that a superior person through sickness or other accident gets caught in a mesh of causes which bring him down to the dependent classes, and on the other hand inferior individuals, through inheritance or "social pull," oftentimes enjoy a very large economic surplus all their lives.

A more inclusive and more nearly correct theory of the genesis of the depressed classes is afforded by the general theory of culture and of cultural evolution. As all culture is learned, whether material or spiritual, it is evident that certain classes and individuals may fail to participate in its benefits. They may fail to learn the needed adjustments, or be prevented from making them by social conditions and institutions. Thus a civilization that sanctions the exploitation of the socially weak, the power of one class over another, war and militaristic

institutions, even self-indulgent vices, or that fails to develop fair conditions of labor and the spirit of co-operation and fraternity among its social classes, will have much more poverty than a civilization which has successfully met all these problems of human living together. If this is correct, then it would seem that the proper development of our civilization in a more socialized direction may be reasonably expected to eliminate widespread poverty.

It may be admitted that slight defects in personal character or ability enter into practically all cases of dependency. This is more apt to be the case in a progressive society like our own, where rising standards of efficiency make the economic struggle more severe all the time. Formerly, for example, any employee could drink and retain his position, but now the drinker quickly loses his position in many industries and gives place to the sober man. Oftentimes, however, such defects that give rise to dependency are not inherent but are produced by social conditions themselves, such as faulty education, bad surroundings, and the like. Through the improvement of social conditions, therefore, there is no doubt that much of the present poverty of the civilized world can be wiped out. This is not saying, however, that poverty and dependency will ever be wholly eliminated. Probably, no matter how ideal social conditions might be, even under the most just social organization, there would be some accidents and variations in individuals which would produce a condition of dependency.

The elimination of poverty and pauperism is not so simple as some suppose. It is not wholly a question of the improvement of objective social conditions; it also involves the control of physical heredity, because many of the principal defects that give rise to dependency are inherent in heredity. But man can control to some extent even the birth of the inferior or unfit classes. This may seem, however, so far in the future that it is idle to discuss it, although, as we shall see, society is undoubtedly taking steps to prevent the propagation of the unfit. In the meantime, however, so long as humanity depends upon the natural elimination of the unfit we shall have poverty, to some

extent at least, no matter how much industrial and social conditions may be improved. Yet without the control of physical heredity or the substitution of artificial for natural selection, poverty can undoubtedly be greatly lessened, and it is the rational aim of applied social science to discover how this may be done. It would seem that the existence of millions of persons in the United States living below the poverty line cannot be justified upon either moral or economic grounds; that it represents a great waste of human life and human resources, and that much of the social maladjustment of which this poverty is an expression might easily yield to wisely instituted remedial measures. If the social maladjustments which are undoubtedly the cause of the bulk of modern poverty were done away with, it is safe to say that it would be reduced to a fraction of its present dimensions.

The Concrete Causes of Poverty.—It is necessary to inquire somewhat more minutely into the concrete conditions, social and individual, which give rise to poverty and dependency. Manifestly the poor do not constitute any single class in society. All classes, in a sense, are represented among the poor, and the causes of poverty which are manifest will depend very greatly upon the class of the poor that is studied. If, for example, we should study the causes of dependency among defective classes, naturally personal defects of various sorts would be emphasized. Again, if we should study almshouse paupers, we should expect to find the causes of their dependency different from the causes of the temporary dependency of those who are dealt with outside of institutions and largely by private societies, especially the charity organization societies of large cities. It is, however, to this latter class of temporary dependents that we should give special attention, because they show most clearly the forces operating to produce the various classes of permanent dependents.

There are two great classes of causes of poverty: objective causes, or causes outside of the individual, that is, in the environment; and subjective causes, or causes within the individual. Let us take up first the objective causes.

The Objective Causes of Poverty may be again divided into causes in the physical environment and causes in the social environment. The causes in the physical environment should not be overlooked, even though to a great extent they may not be amenable to social control. Much poverty in certain regions is caused simply by the unpropitious physical environment, such as unproductive soil, bad climate, and the like. Added to these unpropitious factors in the environment we have also great natural calamities, such as tornadoes, floods, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions. Every one is familiar with the great amount of misery which is caused, temporarily at least, by such calamities. Again, certain things in the organic environment, particularly in the way of disease-producing bacteria, are also productive of much poverty. Certain bacteria exist, we now know, plentifully in nature, such as the malaria germ, to which rightfully has been ascribed the physical degeneracy of people living in certain sections of the earth.

But the most important objective causes of poverty are undoubtedly those found in the social environment,—those which spring from certain social conditions or faults in social organization. Among these the following six are especially important:

(1) *Economic Causes.* Defective industrial organization and economic evils of various sorts are thought by many persons to be the main productive causes of poverty and dependency in modern society, and there can be no doubt that a very large per cent of poverty may be traced directly to economic evils. This is shown by the fact that in the schedules of all charity organization societies "lack of employment" figures as the first or second most conspicuous cause of distress in the cases with which such societies deal. It is usually estimated that from twenty to forty per cent of all such cases of dependency in normal times may be attributed to lack of employment, not due to the employee. It is well known that in periods of industrial depression the number of applicants for aid in our large cities increases enormously, and local strikes and lockouts frequently have the same effect. Again, changes in methods of production through the introduction of new machinery frequently displace large numbers of workingmen,

who, on account of age or other reasons, fail to get employment along new lines. This technological cause of unemployment has been in recent years an increasing cause of dependency. Changes in trade brought about through changes in fashions have to some extent at least a similar effect. Again, fluctuations in the value of money may undoubtedly depress a debtor class to the point of dependency. Unwise methods of taxation, such as levying heavy taxes on the necessaries of life, produce a great deal of poverty and economic distress. Systems of land tenure such as prevail in England and even to some extent in the United States, may also be another economic cause of poverty. The free land which has up to the present time existed in this country has been a great aid against poverty. The employment of women and children in factories is another cause of poverty which needs to be mentioned under this head. As we have already seen, this breaks up the home, and in the case of the employment of children retards the development of the child. Still another economic cause of poverty is unhealthful and dangerous occupations. The disease-begetting occupations in modern industry are very numerous, such as hat making, glass blowing, the grinding of tools, and the like—any work in which there is a great deal of dust. Among dangerous occupations must also be included those in which there are numerous accidents, such as mining and railway occupations. The accidents in factories, in mines, and on highways in the United States each year cause as many deaths and serious injuries as have often resulted in many a petty war. While it is improbable that our great industries can be carried on without some sacrifice of health and life, it seems reasonable to believe that the number of those who are sacrificed at present is far greater than is necessary, and that reasonable precautions in industry might greatly increase the healthfulness of the occupations and diminish the number of accidents to employees.

On the whole, it is probable that these economic causes of poverty figure in from 50 to 80 per cent of all cases, not operating alone, to be sure, but often in connection with faults of character or physical or mental defects in the individual; for it is always to be remembered in

discussing the causes of poverty that one never finds a case which can be fairly attributed to a single cause. The complexity of causes operating in the case of a single dependent family frequently makes it impossible to tell with certainty what is the chief and what are the contributing causes. Oftentimes what appears to be the chief cause, such as lack of employment, has back of it defects in individual character which are not apparent to the investigator. Researches along this line have shown that the number of cases of distress in periods of prosperity which may be attributed to lack of employment may be very greatly reduced when all individual defects are taken into consideration.

But such statements do not hold in periods of industrial depression. Then unemployment becomes the overwhelmingly preponderant cause of distress. The United States has passed through five severe depressions since 1893—the depressions of 1893–96, 1907, 1914–15, 1920–21, and the one beginning in 1929. This last depression was the most severe and most prolonged in recent history, partly because it was a post-war depression affecting the whole world, and partly because of the radical readjustments now made necessary in the world of labor by the coming of the machine age. In the United States from 1929 to 1933 the number of the unemployed rose to between 13,000,000 and 14,000,000, whereas the number of unemployed in normal times is usually not more than one sixth of this amount. Between 1929 and 1933 the number of dependent families increased in the United States, it is estimated, over 1000 per cent, and the amount needed for relief of families and individuals outside of institutions increased over 1000 per cent. By January, 1938, 17 per cent of the total population were receiving relief, and even in August, 1939, 6,000,000 families were still on relief rolls.

In an industrial depression, while at first those who are laid off are the more inefficient and less skilled, yet as the depression advances the skilled and efficient also are found in great numbers among the unemployed. Periodic industrial depressions must therefore be recognized as one of the great causes of continuing poverty in our

civilization; for these depressions pull down to the level of the dependent not merely those with defective skill or character, but many of the ablest and most efficient. Many of these, moreover, through the demoralization and sickness which often accompany prolonged unemployment, are never able again to secure satisfactory places in the world of industry. Thus, the effects of a prolonged industrial depression may be felt for many years after recovery. Here, then, is a serious defect in our economic system which is responsible for much poverty and distress and which evidently must be removed if we are to deal with the problem of poverty scientifically.

(2) Unsanitary conditions of living are frequent causes of poverty. Among these unsanitary conditions may be mentioned especially the housing of the poor. The housing of the poor in badly ventilated, poorly lighted, and unsanitary dwellings greatly increases sickness and death and undoubtedly contributes greatly to their economic depression. The importance of public sanitation, and especially of the prevention of overcrowding and the securing of properly lighted and ventilated dwellings for the people, is so great that its importance is generally recognized.

(3) Defects in our educational system are certainly productive of poverty. Ignorant, illiterate persons are much the more liable to become dependent. In particular the lack of industrial training in our public schools is a prolific cause of dependency in our complex industrial civilization. Unskilled workers usually predominate on relief rolls.

(4) Defects in government, permitting corruption and failing to check economic or sanitary evils, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, fostering ill will and conflict between classes, nations, or races, are manifest causes of poverty. Perhaps no single cause has produced more poverty among civilized peoples recently than war. As all conflict between individuals, classes, nations, or races, is nonproductive, war is one of the great reasons for the continued existence of poverty in civilized nations. Government exists to regulate the whole social order, and wherever it fails to perform this work properly, economic distress must ensue.

(5) Corruption in social institutions and customs is certainly a cause of poverty: such, for example, is the custom of social drinking, and such also the unwise and indiscriminate charity which has so often existed in the past.

(6) Unrestricted immigration, especially in our Eastern states and cities, has been in the past, as we have already seen, a prolific cause of dependency.

The Subjective Causes of Poverty are the causes within the individual. Among these there are eight worth our attention here: (1) Physical and mental defects of all sorts, especially those arising from sickness and accidents. Sickness causing temporary or permanent disability figures, in normal times, in from 15 to 30 per cent of all cases applying for relief in our large cities. Probably it is the most common and most important single cause of poverty with which social workers have to deal. Back of sickness, however, are often remote causes in the environment or in personal character. We have already considered accident as a cause of poverty in connection with dangerous occupations. It is only necessary to note that good authorities estimate that there are over 3,000,000 serious accidents in the United States every year, in order to see that disabilities resulting from accident are prolific as causes of poverty, especially in our large industrial centers. The physical and mental defects which manifest themselves in the defective classes proper, such as the feeble-minded, the insane, the epileptics, the deaf-mutes, and the blind, do not need special discussion as causes of dependency.

(2) Next after sickness in the list of subjective causes of poverty comes intemperance. While the effect of intemperance in producing poverty has often been exaggerated, there can be no doubt that intemperance is one of the most important causes with which we have to deal. Back of intemperance, of course, may often be causes in the social environment, or other remote causes, but these do not detract from the fact that practically one fourth of all the cases of distress with which charity organization societies have to deal are attributable, more or less, to intemperance. The Committee of Fifty

who investigated this subject in the 1890's found that, in thirty-three cities, out of thirty thousand cases dependency was due to personal intemperance in 18.46 per cent, and due to the intemperance of others in 9.36 per cent, making a total of 27.82 per cent of cases in which intemperance could be traced as a cause of poverty. Other investigations conducted in American cities give substantially the same results, although certain other investigations in English cities give higher percentages. It is noteworthy also that in an investigation conducted by the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor 39 per cent of the cases of poverty were attributed directly or indirectly to drink. Again the Committee of Fifty found that in the case of almshouse paupers a considerably higher per cent owed their condition to the influence of drink either directly or indirectly, the percentage being 41.55.

These statistics of the Committee of Fifty have never been successfully refuted, and still stand as a conservative and careful estimate of the influence of intemperance on the production of poverty. Later statistics on the whole tend to confirm these. Thus, in 1912 in several leading American cities it was found that intemperance was an important factor in dependency in 14.8 per cent of the cases. These were, however, cases of temporarily dependent families, relieved in their own homes, and the statistics concern cities in which prohibition of the drink traffic had not begun. After the enactment of the National Prohibition Law, these same cities in 1920 showed only 4.2 per cent of the cases of dependent families in which intemperance was an important factor. This per cent, however, began to rise after 1920, and in 1927 it was found that in thirty-seven American cities intemperance was an important factor in the production of distress in the case of 9.5 per cent of dependent families.

(3) Sexual vice is undoubtedly a prolific cause of poverty, although it is very hard to trace concretely in the study of specific cases. Dr. Dugdale, however, in his study of the Jukes family places sexual vice even ahead of intemperance as a cause of their degradation, and other similar studies of similar families have reached substantially the same results.

(4) Shiftlessness and laziness are frequently found in the lists of causes of dependency used by charity organization societies, from 10 to 15 per cent of the cases of distress being attributed more or less to these causes. It is now generally agreed, however, that in most cases these causes may be resolved into more remote causes, laziness being oftentimes attributable to an undervitalized physical condition.

(5) Old age, which has not been rendered destitute by vice, drink, or other faults of character, is frequently in itself a cause of dependency. Old age seems to figure more largely in European than in American statistics as a cause of dependency; nevertheless, even in America we frequently find old persons who have worked hard all their lives and yet come to poverty in their old age through no fault of their own. It is for this reason that old-age pensions are necessary as a means of preventing dependency among the aged.

(6) Neglect and desertion by relatives, or the disregard of family ties, in America at least, may be put down as one of the important causes of dependency. From five to ten per cent of all the cases of distress, for example, which charity organization societies in our large cities deal with are those of deserted wives. Again, it is particularly common in America for children to fail to support aged parents, and even the desertion of children by parents is of frequent occurrence.

(7) Death of main support must also be mentioned as an important cause of dependency. Widows and their children always figure largely among those helped by charitable societies and institutions. Probably from 10 to 20 per cent of all cases dealt with by societies for relieving temporary distress are cases in which the death of the breadwinner has temporarily rendered the family dependent.

(8) Crime, dishonesty, ignorance, and the like are manifest frequent causes of dependency, and as such need no discussion.

Some of the more important objective and subjective causes of poverty and dependency have now been enumerated in detail in order that the student may see that such causes are very complex, and, as we have already seen, there rarely exists a dependent family in

which several of these causes are not found to be active. Certain questions arise, from such a brief presentation as this, which cannot be adequately dealt with here. Such, for example, is the question whether the subjective causes of poverty can all be reduced to objective causes. Some cannot, because the subjective causes have their roots in biological and psychological conditions which cannot be attributed directly to causes in the environment. No doubt, however, many of the subjective causes of poverty are characteristics which have been acquired by individuals from the influence of their environment. When a certain per cent of poverty is attributed to intemperance, for example, it is probable that that particular personal defect may be ascribed almost wholly to the environment. On the other hand, there are other personal defects, such as sickness, vice, and mental deficiency, that cannot always with certainty be traced to environmental factors. It is safest to conclude that while personality is built up largely out of social influences, society is, on the other hand, also rooted in human nature, so that both objective and subjective causes combine to produce practically all social phenomena, and especially the phenomena of poverty and dependency. It is unscientific, therefore, to disregard either the subjective or the objective causes of poverty.

Another question which is frequently raised in connection with poverty or dependency is whether it is due to misconduct or misfortune. This question really has not much meaning in it when it is analyzed. As we have already seen in practically every case of poverty, personal defects and bad environment combine. Only a few of these personal defects, however, can by any proper use of language be regarded as misconduct. The great mass of poverty, therefore, seems attributable to misfortune rather than to misconduct,—using these words in their popular sense. But such a conclusion as this necessarily rests upon a somewhat superficial examination of the causes of distress which does not enter into the remote springs of personal character and development. On the whole, it seems unwise to attempt to divide the poor into the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor, as has often been

done, for no one can say who is the worthy and who is the unworthy in a moral sense.

Pauperism and Degeneracy. In order to see more clearly the biological roots of dependency we must notice briefly the relation of habitual pauperism to degeneracy. Studies such as that made by Dr. Dugdale of the Jukes family show that unquestionably there is in many instances a close relation between habitual pauperism of various types and degeneracy. Out of 709 in the Jukes family studied by Dugdale 500 had been aided. Pauperism was 7½ times as common among the Jukes as in the ordinary population. Along with the pauperism of the Jukes went prostitution, illegitimacy, crime, and physical disease and defects. Many other studies have shown the same intimate relation between physical degeneracy and habitual dependency or pauperism. There can be no doubt, therefore, that general physical degeneracy, or biological unfitness, is, as already asserted above, a conspicuous factor in the worst cases of chronic pauperism.

The Influence of Heredity upon Pauperism. Studies similar to those already mentioned have shown that dependency is oftentimes hereditary in families from generation to generation. This is doubtless based upon the inheritance of physical and mental defects. Indirectly, therefore, there is such a thing as hereditary pauperism. Now we know from Weismann's law that acquired characteristics are not inherited, but only "germinal" or inborn characteristics. It is not the characteristics, in other words, which are acquired from the influence of environment that are transmitted to offspring, but the characteristics that arise through variations in the germ, caused by forces which are not yet well understood. Defects that are acquired by the individual in his lifetime, in other words, will not be transmitted; but the defects that arise through accident or other means in the germ are transmitted. This being so, it follows that acquired pauperism or dependency is not transmitted but only the pauperism which rests upon innate defects. This is illustrated by the case of the deaf. Deaf-mutes are of two sorts: persons who are born deaf, or the con-

genital deaf-mutes, and persons who become deaf-mutes through diseases affecting the ear in early childhood. These latter are styled adventitious deaf-mutes. Now when congenital deaf-mutes intermarry, they show a strong tendency to transmit their defect to offspring, but the children of adventitious deaf-mutes are normal. Dr. Fay, in his investigations into the marriages of the deaf in the United States, shows that only 0.3 per cent of the children born from the marriages of persons adventitiously deaf and having no deaf relatives are born deaf; while on the other hand, 30.3 per cent of the children born from the intermarriages of persons congenitally deaf, both parents having deaf relatives, are born deaf. In other words, the number of deaf-mutes born where both parents are congenitally deaf and have deaf relatives is one hundred times greater than where both parents are adventitiously deaf and have no deaf relatives. This is pretty conclusive proof that it is only the inborn defects which are transmissible, but these are so highly transmissible that they may express themselves in pauperism from generation to generation.

The marriage of all persons in whom there is an hereditary taint of feeble-mindedness, insanity, epilepsy, and the like ought, therefore, to be forbidden by law. But unless these defective classes were segregated in institutions, the only result of this might be to increase illegitimacy; therefore, any step in eradicating degeneracy and pauperism must look to the isolation and custodial care through life of the hopelessly defective classes. All this gives point to the conclusion that some poverty and pauperism have roots which are quite independent of defects in economic conditions, and that, until heredity itself can be controlled, we cannot expect to eliminate poverty entirely.

Proposed Remedies for Poverty and Pauperism.—The scientific remedies for poverty and pauperism, that is, the scientific methods of dealing with the various dependent classes and of preventing their existence, now form the subject-matter of a great independent science which, as we have already seen, may be considered a branch of applied sociology. There is not room in this book to discuss these remedies adequately, but the student should give attention to the vast litera-

ture existing upon the subject, and should note the trend of modern scientific philanthropy in developing scientific methods for removing the causes of dependency and for preventing the existence of the various dependent classes.

As we have already seen, *poverty is an economic expression of biological or psychological defects of the individual on the one hand, and of faulty social and industrial conditions on the other hand.* This implies that the remedies must be along the lines of the biological and psychological adjustment of the individual and of the correction of the faults in social conditions.

Where biological defects of the individual are the cause of dependency, unless these defects are relatively superficial, the scientific policy for treating these classes of defective individuals would be that of segregation in institutions. The feeble-minded, the chronic insane, the chronic epileptic, and other hopelessly defective persons, in other words, should be permanently kept in institutions where tender and humane care should be provided, but in such a way that they will not reproduce their kind and burden future generations. The policy of segregating the hopelessly defective is one of the most scientifically approved policies of modern philanthropy. In this way, to a certain extent, the reproduction of unfit elements in society might be lessened, and the spread of degeneracy checked. In the case of slightly defective adults, such as the congenitally deaf and the congenitally blind, it is difficult to say exactly what the policy should be. It would seem that many of these persons may be relatively adjusted to free social life, although if they intermarry and have offspring we know, if their defect is innate, that a certain proportion of the offspring, according to Mendel's law, will inherit the defect.

In the case of those individuals whose dependency is due to psychological defects, or defective character, it is evident that we have a different problem. Here, in general, the wise policy would seem to be, not to segregate, but to overcome the defective character. Psychological defects, we know, are much more frequently acquired than biological defects and much more easily remedied. The work of

scientific philanthropy in dealing with this class of individuals must be, therefore, a work of remedying defects in individual character. This is, perhaps, best done through personal relations between the dependent person and those who may help him. Defective character is, on the whole, therefore, best remedied by such means as education, religious influences, friendly visiting, and the like. The class of dependents whose condition is due to defective character may be on the whole, therefore, best treated outside of institutions, and probably better through voluntary private charity than through public relief systems.

There remains another class of dependents whose condition is not due either to biological or to psychological defects in themselves, but to faulty social and industrial conditions. For these, the best method of treatment consists in remedying the faulty conditions or in removing them, if possible. This means that, in many cases, society must provide pensions, insurance against accident and sickness, legislation to check social abuses, and, above all, proper facilities for education. Hence the need of child-labor legislation, of better housing, of industrial insurance, of industrial education, and the like.

In the light of these principles, let us review very briefly the different methods of dealing with dependent classes at the present time.

Public and Private Outdoor Relief. "Outdoor relief" means relief given to the poor outside of an institution. Usually, outdoor relief refers simply to the public relief of dependents outside of institutions, but the phrase as used here will cover both public and private relief. It is evident from what has already been said that the class of persons to whom this form of relief is appropriate are those in temporary distress, whose condition of dependency is not a permanent one and, therefore, usually those whose condition is due either to defective personal character or to faulty social conditions. If the temporary dependency is due to defective personal character, it is evident that the aid may be so given, if given wisely, as to stimulate the overcoming of the moral defect. Hence the need of carefully planned measures of relief in all such cases. Hence, also, the need of "the friendly

visitor" and the professionally trained worker who by personal contact with such a family will help them to become socially adjusted. If, on the other hand, the temporarily dependent person is simply a victim of circumstances, there is, then, also, the need of wise relief in order to overcome those adverse circumstances without impairing the character of the individual receiving relief by destroying his self-respect and the like.

Charity Organization Societies and the Red Cross. It is evident that the task of relieving temporarily dependent persons outside of institutions is a delicate and difficult one, and requires carefully trained workers to do it successfully. For this reason, many have argued that outdoor relief should not be undertaken by the state in any of its branches, such as the city or county. In general, it must be admitted that the private society is, in many cases, naturally better fitted to accomplish this delicate and difficult task of restoring the temporarily dependent person. But, on the other hand, it must be said that the whole matter is simply a question of administration. Private societies have usually not the resources to meet great public emergencies, and may be quite as lax and unscientific in their charity as the state; and it is conceivable that the state can develop a system of outdoor relief which will be administered by experts quite as carefully as any private organization could administer it. Indeed, this was what was practically done in Germany under the *Elberfeldt System*, which was a state system for dispensing outdoor relief to the temporarily indigent.

In the United States the work of relieving the temporarily dependent in their own homes has, in our cities, been undertaken by Charity Organization Societies, also called Associated Charities, and sometimes Family Service Societies. In 1930 there were over 400 such societies in the cities of the United States. In general, these private societies have done the work with more regard for the scientific principles of relief-giving than public agencies. The function of these societies has been to bring about co-operation and organization among the private relief-giving agencies, with the public agencies sometimes included, so that their work will proceed in a more scientific and systematic

way. These societies have therefore had to emphasize the work of *investigation*, not so much to exclude imposters as to secure knowledge of the causes of the distress, and the character and circumstances of the applicant. Such investigation is not for the sake of detecting imposition, but rather for the finding out how a case can best be helped; and of course this can be done only through thorough knowledge of the facts.

A second principle of these societies is *registration*. Careful records are kept of all cases, not only that knowledge may be preserved from year to year, and so give continuity to the work, but also that means may be provided through which the facts of any case shall be accessible to those interested in helping the case, though the records are not open to the general public. Such records prevent the overlapping of relief and give continuity to the plan of relief.

A third principle emphasized by charity organization societies is *co-operation*, or *co-ordination*, though this work is also sometimes undertaken by councils of social agencies. In every community there are always a number of sources of relief, and unless these are carefully organized and brought to co-operate, they will work at cross purposes with the consequent demoralization of the poor.

In general, these societies have sought to proceed upon scientific principles, and to see that charitable relief is individualized, that is, suited to the character and needs of the case; that it is personal and based upon social sympathy, not mechanical and impersonal as it too often is when dispensed by government officials; and, finally, that it is intelligent, proceeding upon full knowledge of the character and circumstances of the applicant.

Charity Organization and Public Welfare Societies are usually local. A national organization proceeding upon somewhat similar principles is the American National Red Cross, which works in close co-operation with the Federal government. In the division of labor among charitable agencies, the Red Cross has taken chiefly the field of emergency relief connected with wars, public disasters and calamities, and the relief of soldiers and sailors, whether active or ex-service men.

The country is divided by the Red Cross into thirteen districts and each local community is supposed to have a chapter. In peace times these chapters look mainly after the relief of former soldiers and sailors, working usually in co-operation with the local public welfare societies or associated charities. On account of the central organization of the Red Cross and the relatively large funds which it has at its disposal, it has been found particularly efficient in the case of public disasters which come from wars, floods, fires, tornadoes, earthquakes, and the like. The Red Cross has also carried on health centers, and extensive education of the public in matters of public health.

State Charitable Institutions. Indoor relief, or relief within institutions, for the permanently dependent classes is probably best undertaken by the state. Originally, the only institution of this sort was the almshouse or the poorhouse; but with the development of our complex civilization many of the permanently dependent have been provided for in other institutions than the almshouse, and it would seem that ultimately all the permanently dependent would be cared for in specialized state institutions. Thus, the permanently dependent, through various sorts of defects, such as the feeble-minded, chronic epileptic, chronic insane, and the like, are properly cared for in institutions especially provided for the purpose by the state and manned by experts. Into the details of public care of the unfit and defective of various types it is not necessary to go further than to say that such public care should be of the most scientific character, and with the double aim of reclaiming all those that can be reclaimed, and of providing permanently tender and humane care for those who cannot be fitted for free social life. State institutions, then, should be manned by experts, and their activities should be co-ordinated by some central board. In accordance with this principle, it would seem that the best state policy would be to provide expert commissions for the care of different classes, such as the insane, and the like, and a supervisory board to watch over the work of these commissions and the institutions.

Dependent Children. The care of dependent children is manifestly one of the most important forms of remedial philanthropic work, for it is manifest that the dependent child will make a dependent adult unless proper measures are taken to secure his adjustment to the social life. The dependent child is rarely biologically defective. The problem is, usually, in his case, the development of character under proper social conditions. For this reason, both the state and private societies have claimed the field of care of dependent children. While private societies have accomplished in this respect some of the most notable work, it would seem, however, that the work is one which properly belongs to the state in its capacity of legal guardian of all dependent children. The state, through a properly organized system of child helping, could conceivably guarantee that every neglected and dependent child should have normal opportunities to become adjusted to the social life. A state system of placing such children in selected private homes kept under careful supervision is generally endorsed by social workers. In general, it is practically agreed by experts that the dependent child cannot be well adjusted to the social life by being reared in an institution, but that the better plan is to find suitable homes in which these children can be placed and reared under state supervision. In this way, practically every dependent child can be guaranteed a good chance in life. In the United States, private societies called "Children's Aid Societies" are also doing this work with great success.

Public and Private Charity. As has already been indicated, the traditional line established by long experience, especially in English public relief, between private charity and public relief is that to private charity should be given the more delicate and difficult tasks, such as readjusting the temporarily dependent persons, the care, in some cases, of dependent children and the like, while to public charity should be given the cases which need permanent relief, especially in institutions. This is only a conventional line, however, between private charity and public relief. It broke down in the emergencies of the depression, and many social workers seem inclined to abandon

it. As has already been pointed out, the state can conceivably undertake the more delicate and difficult tasks of charitable aid, and probably it should do so as rapidly as it demonstrates its fitness to undertake this work, as the state, when once it has achieved certain standards, is a more certain and reliable agency than private institutions or societies. But there is in philanthropic work a large place for the private agency or institution. There will probably always be debatable cases which may better be looked after by private agencies than by public. There is, therefore, in every well-developed community, room for both public and private agencies, although there should be close co-operation, where both exist, each one with the other. The church, through all its history, has undertaken philanthropic work with notable success, and it would be regrettable if the philanthropic activities of the church were to cease at this time, when they are needed as never before, in spite of the large development of public philanthropy. Church charity should, however, be made as scientific as any other form of aid, and should be carefully co-ordinated with the work of the state and other secular agencies. Among the secular agencies, we have already considered the charity organization society as typifying in many ways the highest type of philanthropic activity of the present. It would seem that this society, organizing the philanthropic personal energies of the community, could scarcely be displaced by state acitivity; and that there would remain to this society, as well as to many other private philanthropic agencies, a very large field of activity in the future. State activity in the field of charity is, therefore, to be encouraged; but it must not be supposed that such activity can take the place of all private charity.

Social Security and the Relief of the Unemployed. We have seen that the three chief causes of poverty in modern society are unemployment, sickness, and old age. European nations, very generally, before World War II, adopted the policy of compulsory insurance of the laboring classes against these contingencies of life. We have seen that unemployment is one of the most serious defects in our modern economic life. Practically all the European countries inaugurated some

form of social insurance to cover this contingency. The source of the insurance funds varied in different countries. In some countries a small per cent of the wage was deducted weekly, while the employer contributed an equal amount. The government added a subsidy or merely administered the funds. In England the fund was provided by contributions from employers and employees plus a contribution from the government. The total number of wage workers insured in Great Britain in 1927 exceeded twelve million, and insurance was extended to non-manual workers whose wage was less than $1250 per year. The age of insurance was from sixteen to sixty-four, and the benefits ranged from $4.25 per week to $7.00 per week. Somewhat similar insurance systems existed in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Italy; while in Belgium, Denmark, France, and Norway, state subsidies were granted to trade unions which provided unemployment benefits.

Down to 1935 the United States had lagged behind the European nations in attempts to provide social security for working classes through various forms of insurance. Twenty-eight states had adopted some form of old-age pensions or old-age insurance, but only one had adopted any form of unemployment insurance. In August, 1935, however, owing to the acute economic suffering produced by the industrial depression, our Federal Congress passed the Social Security Act, which provides comprehensive grants to the states for seven principal types of aid: (1) Unemployment insurance; (2) Old-age assistance; (3) Old-age insurance; (4) Aid to dependent children; (5) Maternal and child-welfare benefits; (6) Public health work; and (7) Aid to the blind. These funds are administered mostly by state officials under the strict supervision of, and in co-operation with, a Federal Social Security Board; also, the Federal Children's Bureau, the Federal Public Health Service, and the Federal Office of Education.

The Social Security Act provides for cash benefits to be paid under certain conditions to persons out of work. The payment of these benefits to those out of work is secured by a payroll tax upon the employer of more than eight persons which began at one per cent of

the wages of the employee in 1936, and was later raised to three per cent. The administration of unemployment benefits is strictly correlated with an employment or placement service, maintained jointly by the Federal and state governments, to find jobs for those out of work. This unemployment assistance in 1942 did not yet cover farm laborers, domestic servants, school teachers, social workers, government employees, marine workers, or casual laborers.

The Social Security Act provides for old-age assistance for needy persons over sixty-five years of age. It will pay such persons up to $20.00 a month if the states in which they reside will contribute an equal amount and will pass Social Security laws, approved by the Federal Security Board, creating local boards to investigate applicants.

Looking toward the future, the act also established a system of old-age insurance through a tax levied equally on the employer and on the wages of the employee. Each worker so insured, upon reaching the age of sixty-five, will receive, regardless of need, when no longer employed, a monthly payment determined by his total wages (not to exceed $3000 a year) earned and taxed under the law during his working career. If the worker dies before sixty-five, his family or estate receives the payment. The amount of the tax, in order to accumulate in the Federal treasury a fund to pay these benefits, began in 1936 at one per cent of the wages of the employee not in excess of $3000 per year, with a similar tax upon the payroll of the employer. The tax rises to three per cent on such wages and payrolls after 1948. Again, farm laborers, domestic servants, and other workers already mentioned under unemployment insurance are not included. Even so, this old-age and survivors insurance in 1942 covered more than 48,000,000 workers in the United States.

In addition, the Social Security Act makes liberal grants to states which properly qualify to give aid to dependent children, to provide maternal and child welfare benefits, and to give aid to the blind. The Social Security Act is supplemented by The Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Unemployment Insurance to assist railroad workers

who are not covered by the Social Security Act either as to old-age or unemployment. Even more important, the Social Security Act was buttressed in 1938 by a Wages-and-Hours Act, establishing a minimum wage for over 11,000,000 workers, mainly in big industries. This minimum wage in 1942 was 30 cents an hour for a forty-hour week, with increased pay for work over forty hours. The Act provides that beginning in 1945, the minimum wage shall be 40 cents per hour.

Practically all European countries have also developed some sort of health insurance for wage workers. This is a payment in lieu of wages provided during sickness. In the United States the plan has been widely discussed and bills have been introduced into state legislatures, but have been opposed, not only by employers, but also by some of the labor unions. Some industrial corporations and some labor unions provide, however, some form of sickness insurance on a private basis. The American Medical Association has also strongly opposed compulsory government health insurance for wage workers, because physicians lack confidence in the ability of our government to administer a system of health insurance efficiently. For these reasons and others the Social Security Act did not provide a system of health insurance for wage workers. But it did provide liberal grants to states, provided they matched these grants with equal appropriations, for public health service.

Economic Planning and the Prevention of Unemployment. As we have just seen, the time to prevent poverty is in periods of relative prosperity, and the student should turn at this point to the program of scientific social reconstruction outlined at the end of Chapter XVI. Economic planning to furnish work for all able and willing to work at a living wage is one important aspect of a scientific program of social reconstruction.

Governments have always made use of a certain amount of economic planning. The protective tariff is an example of former government planning, as was also the economic planning of various governments during the War of 1914-18. "Planning" is simply a new word for an old idea. Recent economic planning, however, aspires to

be different—to be more collective and comprehensive, for the good of all classes, not for one; and finally, it aspires to be more scientific.

The advantages of central economic planning for any country have been emphasized by the economic planning of the Soviet government of Russia. But the use of ruthless and arbitrary force in putting such a scheme into effect, which has been the Russian method, could not well be applied in the United States, without disastrous effect to all our institutions. A better example of economic planning for the United States to follow is the controlled capitalism of Sweden. This very successful experiment in economic planning has in it the large element of voluntary co-operation on the part of industrial organizations and leaders which is necessary in a truly democratic society.

An example of national economic planning in the United States was the National Recovery Act, passed by our Federal Congress in June, 1933. This act established a National Recovery Administration which was empowered, with the voluntary co-operation of representatives of each industry, to set up codes of fair practice to govern the industry. These codes established fair wages, virtually abolished child labor, and shortened the hours of labor so as to give employment to a larger number. This Act, however, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1935.

About the same time, to revive industry and give employment to those out of work, the Federal government established a Public Works Administration and later a Work Projects Administration. These agencies gave emergency employment for those out of work to from one and one-half to three million persons in 1935-41. As late as April, 1940, the census reported 2,380,000 "unemployed," engaged on such public emergency work. Public works which are needed should undoubtedly be pressed in periods of unemployment; but these should be carefully supervised to prevent the waste of public funds, and to prevent unnecessary dependence of workers upon government jobs.

The function of government as a regulating and controlling agency of our social order is now fully recognized, and our state and Federal

governments lead in efforts to restore prosperity and to stabilize industry. While some of the measures above mentioned may be temporary in character, it is generally recognized in all civilized nations that the chief economic function of government is the stabilization of industry. There seems to be need of some sort of permanent national social-economic council, made up of the representatives of both workers and employers, to recommend to the President and Congress such measures as in its judgment would contribute to the balanced economic development of the country and to the stabilization of employment.

Manifestly, our economic and industrial life, if it is to avoid industrial depression and the needless creation of poverty among the masses, must be more scientifically organized and controlled. But this matter requires much more than is usually supposed. It requires government that is infused with the scientific spirit, that respects the opinions of scientific experts, and that is directed towards securing the maximum of social welfare. Above all in a democracy, it requires the intelligent co-operation and freedom from political corruption of the masses of people.

Other Preventive Agencies. A very large task for both private agencies and the state is to be found in the field of prevention. This field is so broad, however, that only a few of the many different movements which characterize our present social development can be mentioned here. Such are the movements for better housing, for better sanitation, for purer food, for juster economic conditions, for the prevention of disease, and the like. The main thing to be said with respect to these movements is that they need to be guided by the larger social view, they need synthesis in order that they may work toward a common goal, and in harmony, also, with the activities of the state. In the field of prevention the state has much to do, especially in forwarding education along lines of social need and in creating juster economic conditions.

Summary.—It is evident that the cure of poverty is not to be sought merely in certain economic rearrangements, but in scientific

control of the whole life process of human society. This means that, in order to get rid of poverty, the defects in education, in government, in religion and morality, in philanthropy, and even in physical heredity, must be got rid of. Of course, this can be done only when there is a scientific understanding of the conditions necessary for normal human social life. What some of these requirements for a normal life are will be seen in a subsequent chapter, and it is only necessary to say in conclusion that the wisest measures for removing pauperism will be directed toward the prevention of its causes rather than toward the reclaiming of those who have already been caught in its meshes.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

DEVINE, E. T., *Misery and Its Causes*, Chaps. I-V.

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Social Problem*, Chap. IV.

GILLIN, J. L., *Poverty and Dependency*, 3d Ed., Parts I-II.

WARNER, A. G., QUEEN, S. A., and HARPER, E. B., *American Charities and Social Work*, Part II.

For more extended reading:

BOSSARD, J. H. S., *Social Change and Social Problems.*

DEXTER, R. C., *Social Adjustment.*

DOUGLAS, P. H., *Social Security in the United States*, 2d Ed.

FORD, J., *Social Problems and Social Policy*, Parts III-IV.

FORD, J., and FORD, K. M., *The Abolition of Poverty.*

GILLETTE, J. M., and REINHARDT, J. M., *Problems of a Changing Social Order*, Chaps. 8–17.

GODDARD, H. H., *The Kallikak Family.*

HENDERSON, C. R., *Modern Methods of Charity.*

HENDERSON, C. R., *Preventive Agencies and Methods.*

HURRY, J. B., *Poverty and Its Vicious Circles.*

KELSO, R. W., *The Science of Public Welfare.*

KELSO, R. W., *Poverty.*

LANE, M. D., and STEEGMUELLER, F., *America on Relief.*

MANGOLD, G. B., *Problems of Child Welfare*, Rev. Ed.
MANGOLD, G. B., *Social Pathology.*
NORTH, C. C., *The Community and Social Welfare*, Chaps. II-X.
NORTH, C. C., *Social Problems and Social Planning*, Chaps. VII, X, XI.
ODUM, H. W., *Man's Quest for Social Guidance*, Chaps. XXIX-XXXI.
PARMELEE, M. F., *Poverty and Social Progress.*
PHELPS, H. A., *Contemporary Social Problems*, Rev. Ed.
QUEEN, S. A., and MANN, P. M., *Social Pathology.*
RICHMOND, M., *Social Diagnosis.*
RUBINOW, I. M., *The Quest for Security.*
SOUTHARD, E. E., and JARRETT, M. C., *The Kingdom of Evils.*
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work.
The Survey. (Periodical.)

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What bearing has sociology upon problems of abnormal social conditions? Illustrate.

2. What is the difference between poverty and pauperism? How are they related?

3. How much poverty is there in the United States? in other countries? How much in other times?

4. What is the genesis of poverty?

5. What do we mean by objective and subjective causes of poverty? Discuss the principal objective causes.

6. Discuss the principal subjective causes.

7. Can the subjective causes be reduced to objective? Why not? Which has the greater influence?

8. How does heredity operate as a cause of poverty and pauperism? Illustrate.

9. Show that poverty is a complex matter and not simply an economic phenomenon. Must the remedy also be complex?

10. Can the industrial poverty of modern society be gotten rid of? (See Chapter IV in Ellwood's *The Social Problem.*) How?

11. What do we mean by outdoor relief? What are some of the dangers of public outdoor relief, and how can they be met?

12. Who should be cared for in state institutions, and how should these latter be managed?

13. What is the best system of caring for dependent and neglected children?

14. What line should be preserved, if any, between private and public charity? Which is preferable?

15. Why should charity be organized? Illustrate.

16. Why do we need preventive agencies, and in what way will they accomplish their best work? Illustrate.

17. What provisions are made by the Social Security Act of 1935?

18. Is central economic planning practicable? How and how far?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the extent of poverty in the United States and in some European countries?

2. Is modern poverty the result mainly of natural conditions or of social conditions?

3. What is the relation of modern poverty to industrial unemployment? to taxation? to war?

4. If opportunities for self-help and for employment are most needed, who should furnish them, the state or private enterprise?

5. Can social security (insurance against unemployment, old age, etc.) entirely take the place of relief?

6. Can social work be made scientific? How?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Can widespread poverty be abolished? If so, how?

CHAPTER XV

CRIME

THE problem of crime is one of the great problems of social pathology. There have been developed, in order to deal with this problem scientifically, a number of subsidiary sciences, especially Criminology and Penology, which are sciences dealing with the causes, nature, and treatment of crime. This one chapter cannot, therefore, deal with this problem adequately, but the student should consult some of the literature on the subject for further information (see the Select References at the end of this chapter).

The Definition of Crime.—The best definition of crime and the simplest is that it is a violation of law. It is evident from this definition that crime is primarily a legal matter; and as laws vary from age to age and from country to country, so too do specific definitions of crime vary. Nevertheless, the fact that crime is a variable quantity does not make it impossible of scientific treatment; for law itself is only one aspect or phase of the social life, namely, that which has to do with the control of conduct through organized social authority. Therefore, while crime is primarily a legal matter, it is also a social matter and has at the same time psychological and biological implications. While crime is an expression of social maladjustment defined by the law differently under different circumstances, it nevertheless has psychological and biological roots; and these we must take into account in a scientific study of crime.

The simplest and best definition of the criminal, accordingly, is a violator of the law. However, because the criminal lacks social adjustment the causes of this lack of adjustment are very often in certain psychological and biological conditions of the individual. While the criminal is defined by the law differently from age to age,

he is nevertheless under all circumstances the socially aberrant and sometimes the psychologically and biologically abnormal person. Under all circumstances he is a variation from his group; and whether the causes of his variation are cultural, psychological, or biological is the problem that concerns us.

In the group of socially maladjusted persons whom we call criminals there are many classes, and it is necessary to note the chief of these classes before we can understand the many causes of crime.

The Classification of Criminals. The legal classification of criminals according to the nature of their crime is manifestly of no use for scientific purposes. What we need is a classification of criminals according to their own peculiar nature. Inasmuch as the nature and conduct of a criminal person is largely a matter of his psychology, the most scientific classification of criminals must be upon a psychological basis; and a simple psychological classification can be made upon the basis of *habit*, that is, as to whether the basis of crime is inborn, acquired, or just forming. According to this classification there are three main classes of criminals:

(1) The *mentally defective* criminal is a person in whom the tendency to crime is due to hereditary mental defect. The most common type of the mentally defective criminal is the criminal imbecile or moron. Here belong also the criminal insane, when insanity is due to hereditary defects. Not more than ten or twelve per cent of the insane or feeble-minded, however, commit crime, and the per cent decreases with better care of these defective classes. It is evident that in the mentally defective criminal class biological causes of crime predominate. This class is, however, relatively small among the general criminal class, and it is estimated by experts that it constitutes not more than from 15 per cent to 25 per cent of our prison population.

(2) The *habitual* criminal is a normal person who has acquired the tendency to crime from his social environment. The most marked type of the habitual criminal is the *professional* criminal, who is frequently a person above the average in ability and who deliberately

chooses a career of crime, taking the risks of his calling. It is evident that the professional criminal class is the most dangerous class of criminals with whom society has to deal. A more common type of habitual criminal, however, is the *occasional* habitual criminal, a weak person who drifts into crime through temptation and who has not strength of character enough to throw off the habit. It is estimated that habitual criminals of both types mentioned constitute from 30 per cent to 45 per cent of our prison population.

(3) The *single offender* is a normal person who commits only a single crime through some sudden stress or temptation, but lives ever after a law-abiding life. The two types of the single offender are the criminal *by passion* and the *accidental* criminal. The criminal by passion is a moral, and oftentimes a conscientious, person who commits a crime through some sudden stress of passion, under great provocation. The accidental criminal, on the other hand, is the weak type of moral person who yields once through some sudden temptation, but who regrets it ever afterward. It is estimated that single offenders constitute from 30 per cent to 40 per cent of our prison population. Strictly speaking, they are only legal criminals, and not criminals in the sociological sense, being relatively moral and law-abiding citizens whose variation from the normal is confined to some single offense. Nevertheless, single offenders constitute, as we have seen, a very considerable proportion of our prison population.

This classification of criminals is very important both in studying the causes of crime and in devising practical measures for dealing with the criminal class; for the mentally defective criminal, the habitual criminal, and the single offender manifestly need very different methods of treatment. One of the gravest faults of the criminal law and of penal institutions hitherto is that they have not provided for the different treatment of these different classes of criminals.

The Extent of Crime in the United States.—According to the Census Bureau, there were in prisons or reformatories on January 1, 1933, a total of 233,631 prisoners serving sentences. Of this number about 95.2 per cent were males, and about 4.8 per cent were females.

Classified according to the prisons in which they were found, 149,997 were in Federal and state penitentiaries or in state reformatories, 51,436 were in county jails, on road gangs, or in city prisons, and 32,198 in public juvenile reformatories. It must be remembered that this was the prison population on a single day, January 1, 1933. On July 1, 1922, however, the total number of prisoners reported by the Census was 163,889, of whom 84,213 were in Federal or state prisons. The number of institutions covered by the census varied somewhat in 1922 and 1933.

According to the Census Bureau, there were on January 1, 1939, 160,285 prisoners serving sentences in Federal and state prisons exclusive of those in Georgia and Alabama. The number of such prisoners per 100,000 of the population rose from 74.2 in 1923 to 107.4 in 1938.

These prison statistics, however, give us little idea of the actual amount of crime in the United States, because they include only the persons committed to prison to serve sentences and do not include the vast number who escape the meshes of the law or who simply pay fines, or whose sentences are suspended. It is estimated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, basing the estimate upon the number of known crimes in certain large cities, that there were in 1941 over 1,500,000 serious crimes committed in the United States. In addition to these serious crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates there were 13,000,000 minor offenses.

The prison statistics fail to give us any very correct idea of the amount of serious crimes in the United States, because they understate the matter. A peculiarity about serious crimes in the United States, it must be remembered, is that so many persons escape through the meshes of the law, and this is particularly true in the case of the characteristic American crime of homicide. Our Census authorities estimate that only about one third of those guilty of this crime are convicted in our courts. Thus the census showed that in 1923 there were 3220 persons in the United States committed to prison upon sentence for homicide, while the estimated total number of homicides

committed was about 9000 (estimate based upon census mortality statistics) that year. Until recently the death rate from homicide increased in the United States. Thus it was 5 per 100,000 population in 1906, and 9.6 per 100,000 in 1933; but it was only 6.2 in 1940. The increase up to 1933 was due in part to the addition to the registration area of Southern and Western states where the homicide rate is high. However, the homicide rate in thirty-one of the largest cities rose from 5.1 per 100,000 in the decade 1895-1904 to 10.4 in the decade 1921-1930. The homicide rate varied in the United States in 1940 all the way from 0.8 per 100,000 in Vermont to 21.6 per 100,000 in Florida. Among the Negroes of Florida in 1927 the homicide rate was 81.7 per 100,000. In Southern cities with a large Negro population the rate was higher than in any whole state.

The number of homicides is far greater in the United States than in other civilized countries, not excepting Italy, Spain, and other countries of the Mediterranean region. England and Wales, for example, had about two hundred cases of homicide in 1931 as compared with our about eleven thousand, although England's population was about 40,000,000 as against about 123,000,000 for the United States. The highest homicide rate is found in the Southern and Western states, Florida leading, according to the statistics of 1940, with Georgia second in the list of states. This suggests that to some extent our high homicide rate is due to the survival of frontier traditions in a large number of the states, although it is probably even more due to American individualism and lawlessness, the tendency of every man to take the law into his own hands.

There can be no doubt that the amount of serious crime in the United States is relatively high; and serious crimes against property are several times as numerous as serious crimes against persons.

The Cost of Crime in the United States. In the cost of crime we must include not only the direct costs of crime, such as police, criminal courts, prisons, and the depredations of the criminal class, but also the indirect costs due to fraud, extortion, and "racketeering," and to the use of devices to protect against theft, robbery, embezzlement,

dishonesty, and other crimes. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover estimates that the direct and indirect costs of crime are as high as $15,000,000,000 annually. In a careful computation in 1920 Dr. William Healy estimated that the *direct* cost of crime in the United States in one year was not less than $900,000,000. He says, "When we consider the expenses of police forces, courts, probation systems, jails, and many other institutions for offenders, we can understand the reason for the magnitude of the figures and perhaps appreciate that in these forms of public service there is little suggestion of over-spending."

We may compare the amount of the cost of crime with certain other figures. The cost of the public school system in the United States in 1940 was about $2,500,000,000; the cost of supporting our churches and religious work was about $750,000,000; the average annual value of our wheat crop and our cotton crop is each about $700,000,000. It is evident that the problem of crime is worthy of serious study even from a financial standpoint alone.

Is Crime Increasing? How we answer this question will, of course, depend upon the length of time considered. We have no statistics going back further than about 1850 in this country. Moreover, it is entirely possible to hold that while crime has decreased during the historic era among civilized peoples, it has increased during the last century in the United States. All statistics of serious crime in the United States seem to show that it has increased. In 1850, for example, the number of prisoners was 6737, which was one prisoner in every 3442 of the population. But the census of 1850 was seriously defective, and it would be better to take the census of 1860 as the basis of our comparison. In 1860 the census showed a total prison population of 19,086, which was one prisoner in every 1647 of the population. In 1890 the census showed 82,320 prisoners in the total population, which was one in every 757. In other words, between 1860 and 1890 the total population of the country just doubled, while the number of prisoners quadrupled.

The value of these statistics has often been questioned, but it has been questioned chiefly by people who have not taken other cor-

roborative evidence into account. The chief corroborating evidence is to be found in the statistics of prisoners in our state prisons from 1880 to 1939. Now only those are sent to state prisons who are guilty of felonies, and the length of term of sentence in our state prisons has steadily shortened during the last fifty years, while within the last decades the practice of suspending sentence on probation for first felons has also largely increased. We should expect, therefore, a decrease in the state prison population in proportion to the general population. But we find that the number in state prisons rose from 30,659 in 1880, to 45,233 in 1890, an increase of 47.5 per cent, while the general population increased only 24.86 per cent. From 1910 to 1939 the number rose from 68,735 to 151,000, an increase of 134.1 per cent, while the population increased only 42.5 per cent. Apparently, therefore, the amount of serious crime in the United States has increased more rapidly than the population. Corroborating evidence is also found in the statistics of Negro crime (one of the main elements in the increase), which has increased very rapidly at times. Other evidence has been already cited, but the statistics of our state penitentiaries may be considered conclusive when all facts are taken into consideration.[1] There is apparently no escape from the conclusion that serious crime, since 1860, has increased more rapidly than the population.

For several years prior to World War I the statistics of most European countries indicated an increase in minor offenses, as did also some fragmentary American statistics. During that war, crime decreased temporarily in most of the belligerent nations. England is the only country in which over a long term of years there was, down to 1933, a decrease of both serious crimes and minor offenses in proportion to population. This decrease of crime in England must be attributed largely to England's excellent police and prison systems and to the swiftness and certainty of English courts of justice.

[1]See the writer's article on this question in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. I, pp. 378–385; also an article in Vol. III, pp. 754–769.

The Causes of Crime.—The causes of crime may be classified best, like the causes of poverty, into objective and subjective. Objective causes are those outside of the individual, in the environment; subjective causes are causes in the individual, whether in his bodily make-up or in his mental peculiarities.

The Objective Causes of Crime. The objective causes of crime may be divided into causes in the physical environment and causes in the social environment. The causes in the physical environment are relatively unimportant, but are worthy of note as showing how many various factors enter into this social phenomenon of crime. Climate and season seem to be the two chief physical factors that influence crime; and in connection with these we have two general rules, abundantly verified by statistics; namely, the ratio of crimes against the person is higher in warm climates than that of crimes against property; and also the ratio of crimes against the person is higher in summer than in winter, while crimes against property are relatively more numerous in winter than in summer. All this is probably an outcome of the effect of climate and season upon general living conditions.

The causes of crime in the social environment are of course much the most important objective causes of crime, and, many students think, altogether the most important causes of crime in general. Let us briefly note some of the more important social conditions that give rise to crime.

(1) Conditions connected with the family life have a great influence on crime; indeed, inasmuch as the family is the chief agency in society for socializing the young, perhaps domestic conditions are more important in the production of crime than any other set of causes. We have already seen in former chapters that demoralized homes contribute an undue proportion of criminals. It is estimated by those in charge of reform schools for delinquent children that from 85 to 90 per cent of the children in those institutions come from more or less demoralized or disrupted families. Illegitimate children notoriously drift into the criminal classes, while dependent children who grow up in charitable institutions are prone also to take the same course.

Domestic conditions also have of course an influence on the criminality or noncriminality of adults. This is best shown perhaps by the fact that so large a proportion of criminals in our prisons are unmarried persons. Thus the United States prison census of 1939 showed that 51.9 per cent of all the prisoners were single persons. Statistics from other countries are practically the same. This means that, on the one hand, the family life is a preventive of crime, and on the other that the socially abnormal classes who drift into crime are not apt to marry.

(2) Industrial conditions also have a profound influence upon criminal statistics. Economic crises, hard times, strikes, lockouts, are all productive of crime. Quetelet, the Belgian statistician, thought that the general rule could be laid down that as the price of food increases, crimes against property increase, while crimes against persons decrease. At any rate, increase in the cost of the necessities of life is very apt to increase crimes of certain sorts.

The various industrial classes show different ratios of criminality. In general among industrial classes the least crime is committed by the agricultural classes, while the most crime is committed by the unemployed or those with no occupation. The prison census of 1923 showed that 31 per cent of all prisoners committed that year were unemployed at the time their crimes were committed, or were persons of no occupation.

The investigations of the Wickersham Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement showed that there was a very close connection between unemployment and crime. From forty to fifty per cent of the men admitted to Sing Sing Prison in the year ended February 28, 1930, were found to have been unemployed. Lack of employment seemed especially to conduce to crimes against property, such as robbery, larceny, and burglary. Another investigation in Cincinnati about the same time showed that 40 per cent of all misdemeanor arrests were of the unemployed classes, although it was estimated that the unemployed at that time constituted only 8 per cent of the total population of Cincinnati.

Economic conditions, moreover, not infrequently foster crime in other ways than through poverty and unemployment. The practices of the business world in the United States have been too frequently of such a nature as to encourage the development of a professional criminal class. The Wickersham Commission declared: "The first thing to be realized in the study of the professional criminal is that he responds to the prevailing philosophy and the prevailing attitudes of an acquisitive society. He is after the same great good for which so many others are striving—money." It quotes with approval: "The unpleasant truth is that the racketeer has simply taken an American political and social ideal, wealth, and tried to achieve it in a minimum of time according to his peculiar lights," and adds that the sole inspiration and objective of the racketeer is the possession of wealth. "Racketeering" has recently become one of the gravest forms of criminal activity in our large cities. It is simply a new name for the securing of money through various forms of extortion and intimidation. It is a name also applied sometimes to various forms of fraud. It is asserted that in some of our larger cities various lines of business and industry have fallen under the control of racketeers, who extort from the businessmen in these lines millions of dollars every year for alleged protection. This is of course one of the gravest forms of professional crime, and on account of its alliance with corrupt politics it has proved to be one of the most difficult to deal with.

(3) Urbanization and other conditions concerning the distribution and density of the population have an influence upon crime. In general there is more crime, in proportion to the population, in the cities than in the country districts. The statistics of all civilized countries seem to show about twice as great a percentage of crime in their large cities as in the rural districts.

(4) The influence of race and nationality seems to be marked in criminal statistics. We have already seen that the ratio of criminality among the Negroes in the United States is nearly three times higher than among the whites. Among our recent immigrants, also, the southern Italians have shown a more than average tendency to serious

crime. Among our older immigrants the Irish, on the other hand, owing largely to their love of liquor, have shown a pronounced tendency toward minor offenses. These variations of the crime rate in races and nationalities are in the main to be explained by the different cultures associated with different groups.

(5) Defects in government and law are among the most potent causes of crime. These are so numerous that they cannot all be listed here. It is obvious, however, that such things as too great leniency on the part of our judges and shortness of sentence of convicts, difficulty or uncertainty in securing justice in criminal courts, costliness of obtaining justice in our civil courts, bad prison systems in which first offenders and hardened criminals mingle, lack of police surveillance of habitual criminals, corrupt methods of appointing the police, partisanship in the administration of government, and the like, all conduce to crime. And many of these things, it should be noted, have been especially in evidence in America.

(6) Educational conditions have undoubtedly a great influence upon crime. While education in the sense of school education could never in itself stamp out crime, still defective educational conditions greatly increase crime. This is shown sufficiently by the fact that illiterates are much more likely to commit crime than those who have a fair education. The prison census of 1923 showed that 10.7 per cent of the prisoners were illiterate, while only 7.1 per cent of the general population twenty-one years of age or over were illiterate. Of major offenders a still higher per cent are generally found to be illiterate.

The defects in our educational conditions which especially favor the development of crime in certain classes are, chiefly, lack of facilities for industrial education, lack of physical education, and lack of specific moral instruction. The need of these three things in a socialized school system need not here be more than emphasized.

The influence of the press and the motion picture as popular educators must here be mentioned as among the important stimuli to crime. The excessive exploitation of crime in the sensational press and in motion picture shows conduces to increased criminality in certain

classes, for it has been demonstrated that crime is often a matter of suggestion or imitation. When a large proportion of the motion picture shows are taken up with depicting crime and immorality, it is not to be wondered at that the contagion of crime is sown broadcast in society.

(7) The influence of certain social institutions in producing crime must be mentioned. Here comes in especially the lack of opportunities for wholesome social recreation among our poorer classes, particularly in our large cities. Lacking these, the masses resort to the saloons, gambling houses, cheap music and dance halls, and vulgar theatrical entertainments, while their children have to play in the streets. The influence of all of these conditions is undoubtedly to spread the contagion of vice and crime.

(8) The influence of manners and customs upon crime cannot be overlooked. The custom in certain communities, for example, of carrying concealed weapons undoubtedly has much to do with the swollen homicide statistics of the United States. Vicious and corrupting customs, such as compulsory social drinking, and the like, undoubtedly greatly influence crime. Even the luxury and extravagance of the rich might easily be shown to have a demoralizing effect, upon both the upper and the lower classes of society.

The list of causes of crime in the social environment might be indefinitely extended until the student would perhaps think that practically everything was a cause of crime in one way or another; and it is true that everything that depresses men in society is a cause of crime. However, if the student has gained an impression of the great complexity of the causes of crime, that is the main thing.

A question may here be raised whether it is possible to reduce all the causes of crime to causes in the social environment—that is, all subjective causes to objective. Many writers have contended that this is possible, but we shall see that there are causes in heredity and causes in psychological conditions, to say nothing of some possible free will in individuals, which cannot be derived from social conditions and which would produce crime quite independent of objective social

conditions, unless these subjective factors were also controlled. There is no reason to believe that a perfectly just social organization which did not attempt to control heredity and the moral character of individuals would succeed in eliminating crime. On the contrary, biological variation alone arising from influences independent of the environment would produce a certain amount of crime. Crime, in other words, is, to a certain extent, like pauperism, an expression of the elimination of the inferior variants in society. But a better statement would be that crime is an expression of the failure of society to socialize its individual members. Law-abiding traditions have to be learned by the members of a group, and the opportunities to learn them may be very unequal in large and complex human communities. Moreover, the laws and the conditions of life may be such that individuals find great difficulty in conforming to them. Neither laws nor social conditions are perfect. Crime is mainly a product of the group's culture. Hence it is true in a certain sense, as Lacassagne said, that "every society has the criminals it deserves"; or in other words, society could, by taking proper means, practically eliminate crime and the criminal class. This would have to be done, however, by something more radical than a mere reorganization of human society in an industrial way. Three things are necessary for society practically to eliminate crime: first, the correction of defects in social conditions, particularly of economic evils in society; second, the proper control of physical heredity by a rational system of eugenics; third, the proper education and training of every child for social life from infancy up.

The Subjective Causes of Crime. In order to see all that is involved in the above program let us study somewhat the subjective causes of crime. These may be divided into biological and psychological. Among the biological causes of crime, and one which certainly cannot be reduced to the environment, is sex. As we have already seen, crime is a social phenomenon which is chiefly confined to the male sex. In 1938, for example, 96.5 per cent of the prison population in the United States were males, and in the statistics of convictions it is esti-

mated that ninety-five men are convicted for every five women. The statistics for all civilized countries show practically the same conditions, although in most European countries the proportion of female prisoners is somewhat higher, owing, undoubtedly, to certain influences in the social environment.

Another subjective factor in crime, which again cannot be reduced to environment, is age. Practically all crime falls in the active period of life, and the bulk of it between the ages of twenty and forty years. The average age of men in our state penitentiaries is usually not above twenty-six or twenty-seven years.

Certain abnormal biological conditions are alleged to favor crime. Let us now examine the relation of these abnormal conditions, including heredity, to crime.

Biological Factors in Crime. Late in the nineteenth century Dr. Cesare Lombroso, a professor of psychiatry in Turin, Italy, proposed a biological theory of crime. He attributed crime chiefly to atavism, that is, reversion to a primitive type of man. He claimed that the criminal in modern society represented the survival of the savage type of man; that criminals present a distinct "anthropological variety" and a marked "criminal type," which can often be made out before a person has committed a crime. He asserted that the criminal type is marked physically by having five or more of the stigmata of phsyical degeneration, and is marked mentally by having the characteristics of the savage man. But this biological theory of crime proposed by Lombroso and his followers is unsound. Undoubtedly in some cases crime has biological roots; but to claim that the criminal constitutes a well-marked "anthropological variety" of the human species is to set up a claim for which there is no foundation. Criminals, as we have already seen, are frequently found among the insane, the feeble-minded, and other degenerate classes. But careful research since Lombroso's time shows that there is no criminal type which clearly separates the criminal from other elements in the population. Nor is there any type which we are justified in calling the "born criminal." Lombroso and his school overemphasized the physical and anatomical

side of the study of the criminal and slighted the social and cultural side of such study.

Influence of Physical Degeneracy upon Crime. A word needs to be said about possible relations between criminality and various forms of biological degeneracy. The ordinary forms of physical degeneracy recognized by psychiatrists are feeble-mindedness, chronic insanity, chronic epilepsy, and the like. There can be no doubt that criminality is sometimes related to these functional forms of biological degeneracy. Even ordinary people have noticed the similarity to insanity, while Lombroso traced elaborate parallels between criminality and imbecility and also epilepsy.

Without accepting extreme views, it must be recognized as a fact that investigations such as that of the Jukes family by Dr. Dugdale, and of the Kallikak family by Dr. Goddard, have established that criminals, paupers, imbeciles, drunkards, prostitutes, and other degenerates frequently spring from the same family stock. But in all of these cases a bad environment has been found accompanying a bad heredity. Habitual criminals probably show functional forms of biological degeneracy more often than we find these forms in the population at large. But this fact does not show that the bulk of criminals in modern society come from physiologically degenerate stocks. The marks of biological degeneracy are more apt to be found in criminals by hereditary defect than in other classes of criminals.

The Influence of Heredity on Crime. A further word is necessary about the influence of heredity on crime. The student will remember that according to the modern theory of heredity, acquired characters, or characteristics, are not transmissible. Accordingly, when we find crime running in a family for generations, as in the Jukes or Kallikak families, we must assume either that the criminal tendency is due to the social environment or that it is due to some congenital variation in some ancestor. In other words, if a person is a criminal by hereditary defect, as may be assumed in the case of the defective criminal, he may transmit the tendency toward crime because of his hereditary defect; but if a normal person becomes a criminal by acquired habit

he will transmit no tendency toward crime to his children, although they may, of course, acquire the tendency from their social environment.

This is not saying, however, that in such cases as habitual drunkenness and habitual vice an impaired constitution may not be transmitted to offspring. But this, strictly speaking, is not the transmission of any specific acquired characteristic, but only a general transmission of impaired vitality which may show itself in crime and in various forms of degeneracy. The germ cells are of course a part of the body, and anything that profoundly impairs the nutrition of the body generally, such as alcoholism and constitutional diseases, may also impair the nutrition of the germ cells, and result in a weakened constitution in offspring.

In conclusion, the student will do well to be wary of any biological theory of criminality, and especially of those popular theories which attribute criminality in a very high per cent of cases to hereditary biological defect. We must recognize that crime is often a normal development of human behavior under certain social and cultural conditions.

Intemperance as a Factor in Crime. Among the subjective conditions of the individual that foster crime are antisocial habits, aims, and ideals. Of peculiar interest among personal habits that have an influence upon crime, is intemperance in the use of alcoholic beverages, though this is generally brought about by objective social conditions. Intemperance is such an important cause of crime that it should be examined here in some detail. It has sometimes been said that 95 per cent of crime is the result of this cause alone. Scientific investigations before the establishment of national prohibition failed to show that this was true. For example, the Committee of Fifty investigated the cases of 13,402 convicts late in the 1890's with reference to this matter and found that intemperance was a cause of crime in the cases of 49.95 per cent. It was a chief cause of crime, however, only in the cases of 31.18 per cent. In the other 18.77 per cent the intemperance was that of ancestors or associates. These investigations of the Com-

mittee of Fifty still stand as the best evidence which we have of the influence of intemperance in causing crime in pre-prohibition days. The wonder is that intemperance could figure in so many cases when there are so many and varied factors in the production of crime. These figures still demonstrate that the unrestricted use of alcoholic beverages is a potent factor in the production of crime.

It is often claimed that the National Prohibition Law resulted in increasing crime rather than in decreasing it. This, however, seems to be a very doubtful claim. There is much reason for believing that if there had not been a National Prohibition Law after the war of 1914–1918, we might have had a much greater increase of crime than we did have. All of this, however, is merely a matter of opinion, and cannot be demonstrated one way or the other. What is true is that arrest for public intoxication in forty-eight American cities went down immediately after the enactment of national prohibition. Thus in 1915 the number of arrests for public intoxication in these cities per 100,000 of their population was 177.51. In 1918 under wartime restrictions the number of such arrests had decreased to 140.01 per 100,000 of the population. In 1920 after the National Prohibition Law became effective the number of arrests for public intoxication in these cities declined to 67.80 per 100,000 of their population. After 1920, however, the number of arrests began slowly to increase, and by 1928 it had reached 146.14 per 100,000 of the population of these same cities, a figure not so high as the pre-prohibition figure, but sufficiently high to indicate that the prohibitory law was not effectively enforced. Moreover, in the great increase of prisoners in state and Federal penitentiaries between 1920 and 1930, only a small part of that increase can be attributed to the Prohibition Law. In 1930 less than five per cent of the prisoners in state prisons were there on account of the violation of liquor laws, and less than one half of those in Federal prisons. It will be remembered, of course, that the violators of liquor laws were dealt with mainly by the Federal authorities, and were liable to be sent to Federal prisons. The total number of Federal prisoners in the year 1930 was a little over 8000.

Probably the influence of the National Prohibition Law on crime was indirect rather than direct. It was the opinion of a majority of the Wickersham Commission that the National Prohibition Law had indirectly fostered crime through making the bootleg traffic in liquor very profitable. According to the statement of one member, "the power of the murderous criminal organizations flourishing all over the country has been fostered by the enormous profits made in bootleg liquor traffic. These profits are the main source of the corruption funds which cement the alliance between crime and politics and corrupt the law-enforcing agencies in every populous city." In other words, the toleration of the bootleg liquor traffic by our law-enforcing authorities so enormously enriched the underworld that it became powerful enough to defy state and city governments, and to seek to make bargains with law-enforcing officers and thus gain immunity from prosecution for its crimes. It is the old story that a law poorly enforced is frequently more demoralizing to a people than no law on the same subject.

Remedies for Crime.—The remedies for crime are dealt with by subsidiary sciences which may be regarded as branches of applied sociology. The student should give some attention to the vast literature on the subject, after noting here that the cure for crime consists not in some social panacea or in social revolution, but in dealing with the causes of crime so as to prevent the existence of the criminal class. In a general way, we have already seen, in the discussion of the remedies for poverty and pauperism, what the steps must be to eradicate crime. In order practically to eliminate crime in society, just as in order to eliminate poverty and pauperism, three things are necessary. First, every individual must have a good birth; that is, heredity must be controlled so that only those who are physically and mentally sound are allowed to marry and reproduce. The difficulties of doing this have already been noted. Second, every individual must have a good training, both at home and at school, so as to adjust him properly to the social life. His education must fit him to take his place among other men, make him able to take care of himself, and to help others;

and make him, in every possible way, acquainted with the social inheritance of the race. Last but not least, just social conditions must be provided. Everything in the social environment must be carefully looked after in order to insure the best development of the individual and to prevent his environment from being in any way a drawback to him.

These things, if it were possible to bring them about, would wipe out crime, or, at least, minimize it to the lowest terms. Of course, this cannot be done in a generation, perhaps not in many generations, but it is evident that the problem of crime is in no way an insoluble problem in human society. With time and care and scientific knowledge, crime, as well as poverty and pauperism, could be reduced to a small fraction of what it now is in American society.

The Reformation of the Criminal.—Curative measures are important, also, in dealing with the criminal, and each distinct class must be dealt with differently. We noted in the beginning of the chapter the three great character types in the criminal class: the mentally defective criminal, in whom the tendency toward crime is innate; the habitual criminal, who acquires the habit of crime from his surroundings; and the single offender, who, while committing a single offense, never becomes a criminal in the strictest sense. These three distinct classes of criminals, who might be styled the degenerates, the derelicts, and the accidental offenders, need to be recognized in our criminal law and to be dealt with differently by our criminal courts and correctional institutions. The mentally defective criminal can scarcely be adjusted to normal social life. He is, as we have already seen, usually more or less feeble-minded. Reformation in the fullest sense of the word is almost out of the question in his case. The proper policy for society with reference to the mentally defective criminal class, which constitutes but a small portion of our total criminal population, would be segregation for life. Practically, of course, this may have its difficulties until we perfect our means of discovering slight mental defects in individuals which make them incapable of social adjustment, but practically, also, we have found means of recognizing this type by

such marks as incorrigibility, recidivism, and the stigmata of degeneracy.

The habitual criminal, who originally was a normal person, can be, at least in the early part of his career, fully reformed. Children and adolescents, even though habitual offenders, are easily susceptible of reformation, but this is difficult with the adult habitual offender past thirty years of age who has a long criminal record behind him. Like the mentally defective criminal, he is scarcely capable of reformation. Hardened habitual offenders, and especially professional criminals, should, therefore, be given indeterminate sentences, terminable only when adequate evidence of their reformation has been secured.

The single offender, who is usually a reputable citizen who commits crime through passion or through great temptation, can usually best be dealt with outside of prison walls. The young single offender, if not properly handled, may be easily transformed into an habitual criminal. On the whole, a young single offender who has had no criminal record is, perhaps, best dealt with by the system of probation which will be described later in this chapter. On the other hand, certain single offenders past thirty years of age, such as bribe givers and bribe takers, may have to be punished by society in order that they may be an example for others. Exemplary punishment is, undoubtedly, still necessary in some cases, and in the main it should be reserved for this class of mature offenders in society who have otherwise lived reputable lives. Just how far exemplary punishment should be used in society as a deterrent to crime is a disputed question among penologists. Whether, as in cases of homicide, it should ever go to the extent of capital punishment or not depends very much upon the civilization of the group. In a civilization such as ours, where blood vengeance is so often demanded by mobs, it is probably unwise, for the present at least, to seek the abolition of capital punishment for murder in the first degree.

The Prison System. Every state should have at least six distinct sets of institutions to deal with the criminal class:

1. County and city jails for the detention of offenders awaiting trial.

2. Reform schools for delinquent children under sixteen years of age who require institutional treatment.

3. Industrial reformatories for adult first offenders between sixteen and thirty years of age who require institutional treatment.

4. Special reformatories for vagrants, inebriates, and prostitutes.

5. A hospital prison for the criminal insane.

6. County and state penitentiaries for incorrigible, hardened criminals.

If any one of these sets of institutions is lacking in a state, it is impossible for the state to deal properly in a remedial way with the problem of crime. All these institutions, of course, need to be manned by experts and equipped in the best possible way. The present condition of our jails, of our penitentiaries, and to some extent of our reform schools, frequently makes them schools of crime. Nothing is more demoralizing in any community than a bad jail where criminals of all classes are herded together in idleness; first offenders should by all means be kept apart from hardened criminals. Again, the administration of some of our state penitentiaries with an eye to profit only, makes them places for the deformation of character rather than for its reformation. Again, the lack of special institutions to deal with habitual vagrants, drunkards, and prostitutes, is one of the great reasons why we find it so difficult to stamp out crime. Into the details of the organization, construction, and management of these institutions we cannot go in this book. It is sufficient to note that all these institutions should furnish specialized scientific treatment for the various delinquent classes with which they deal, and to do this they should aim to reproduce the conditions and discipline of free life as far as possible. These institutions, in other words, with the exception of the penitentiaries and other institutions for segregation, should aim at overcoming defective character in individuals. Their work is mainly, therefore, a work of remedying personality defects in the individual which prevent his proper adjustment to society. In the case of penitentiaries, however, the work is one mainly of segregation, of providing humane care under such conditions as least to burden society,

and at the same time give such opportunity as there may be for reformation.

Substitutes for Imprisonment. We have already noted that some classes of offenders may be reformed outside of prison walls. This is especially true of children, of the younger misdemeanants, and of those who have committed their first felony. It has been found that by suspending sentences in such cases, giving the person liberty upon certain conditions, and placing him under the surveillance of an officer of the court who will stand in the relation of friend and quasi guardian to him, reformation can, in many cases, be easily accomplished. This is known as *the probation system.* It has been characterized as "a reformatory without walls." Originating in Massachusetts, it has been increasingly put into practice of recent years in many states with much success. The system, however, will not work well without trained probation officers to watch over those who are given conditional liberty. The practice of placing upon probation without probation officers is a questionable one and is liable to bring the whole system into dispute. Probation is not mere leniency, as some suppose, but is rather a system of reformation in line with the most scientific approved methods.

Coupled with probation should often go fines and restitution to injured parties. In such cases, when the person is placed upon probation, the fine or restitution may often be paid in installments, and it has been found to have a decidedly reformatory effect upon the character of the offender. Fines without probation are, however, but little more than retribution, or exemplary punishment.

Delinquent Children. The treatment of delinquent children constitutes a special problem in itself. It has recently come to be well recognized that criminal tendencies nearly always appear in childhood, and that if we can overcome these tendencies in the delinquent child we shall largely prevent the existence of an habitual criminal class. Strictly speaking, of course, the child is a presumptive rather than a real criminal. The delinquent child is socially maladjusted and is scarcely ever to be considered an enemy of organized society. De-

linquent children should be dealt with, therefore, as presumptive rather than as genuine criminals. In general they should not be arrested, should not be put in jail with older offenders, and should be tried by a special court in which the judge representing the state plays the role of a parent. For the most part, delinquent children may be dealt with, as we have already seen, by putting them upon probation under the care of proper probation officers. When the home surroundings are not good, such children may often be placed in families and their reformation may thus be more easily secured than if they were placed in institutions. In any case, they should never be sent to the reform school except as a last resort. The parent or guardian, also, should be held responsible for the delinquency of the child if he is contributory thereto by his negligence or otherwise.

The Liquor Problem and Crime Prevention. Alcoholic beverages and some narcotics have been so productive of antisocial conduct that practically all civilized governments have attempted some form of restriction of their use. If their abuse could be prevented, a large factor in producing crime would be eliminated. In the modern world, this movement began to rise in the eighteenth century after the use of distilled liquors as beverages had been popularized. The whole of the nineteenth century witnessed ineffectual attempts at the solution of the problem. Prohibitory laws were passed in a great number of American states, even before the Civil War, but they were never well enforced. Among English-speaking peoples, the prohibition movement gained great impetus during the early years of the twentieth century, and World War I resulted in an attempt to carry out prohibition of the supply of alcoholic beverages in the United States, Canada, and some other countries. The National Prohibition Law became effective in the United States, January 5, 1920, and as we have seen from statistics already presented, it was at first apparently fairly well enforced and observed, with great resulting benefits in decrease of the amount of alcohol consumed and of cases of public intoxication, and in increase in financial saving for the whole people, especially the working classes.

But this law was an idealistic one which required high social ideals on the part of our people for its enforcement and observance. It must be remembered that law is based upon the habits and convictions of a majority of the people, and that in a democracy laws can be enforced only in proportion as they are generally observed. The difficulty of enforcing the prohibition law in the United States was chiefly connected with the habits of a large element of the American people who did not change their attitude toward drink. Believing that it was right for them to drink personally, they made it practically impossible to enforce prohibition laws, whether state or national. Consequently, a bootleg liquor traffic sprang up which, as we have seen, became intimately allied with the criminal underworld, and served to finance the operations of criminal gangs. The fact that other countries failed to pass prohibition laws and that our nearest neighbor, Canada, abandoned prohibition, made it particularly difficult to enforce the law in the United States. Probably the gravest reason for the failure of prohibition in the United States, however, was that the law was tried at a time when there was a general decline in moral idealism among the American people. Obviously, an idealistic law will not be observed by a people who do not possess a great deal of social idealism. These statements are particularly true of our upper classes. It was the educated and privileged classes who in the main led the fashion, borrowed from the customs of European society, of using alcoholic beverages to promote sociability. The fashion of drink in these classes thus fostered the bootleg traffic and at the same time undermined respect for law among the young. Consequently, after 1920, the amount of alcohol consumed by the American people, and the number of arrests for intoxication, as we have already seen, slowly increased.

It was this situation which led the Wickersham Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement to recommend certain changes in the National Prohibition Law. After careful study the Commission came to three principal conclusions:

1. It opposed the mere repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, but

recommended instead that Congress should have full power to regulate or prohibit the liquor traffic.

2. It opposed the restoration in any manner of the legalized saloon.

3. It opposed the Federal or state governments going into the liquor business.

The opposition of the Commission to the Federal or state governments going into the liquor business was based upon the experience of Canada and of some of our states, such as South Carolina. After Canada abandoned its federal prohibition in 1920 the Canadian provinces experimented with a system of control, which, while varying in different provinces, yet essentially created a state monopoly of the sale of alcoholic beverages. The results in Canada can scarcely be claimed to have been satisfactory, for under the system of so-called state control, violation of liquor laws between 1923 and 1929 nearly doubled, while convictions for public drunkenness greatly increased.

The Wickersham Commission in their second conclusion also condemned by implication the systems found in Great Britain, France, and Germany. In these countries the licensing system of private dealers still obtains, with relatively stringent regulations as to the conditions under which liquor may be sold. While drunkenness has decreased in these countries, it seems probable that this decrease is due more to the increased cost of alcoholic beverages than to the restrictions which have been put upon their sale.

A number of the prominent members of the Wickersham Commission, led by Mr. Henry W. Anderson, endorsed for this country the Swedish or "Bratt" System. Under this system the government grants a monopoly for the distribution and sale of alcoholic beverages to a central *private* corporation which is held strictly responsible to the government. The general government chooses a majority of the directors of the central corporation, and local governments have the same control over subsidiary local selling corporations. Under this system there is local option and any state, county, or city would have the right of total prohibition. Purchases may be made only by holders of permits, the granting of which is strictly regulated. Thus the

amount of liquor which may be sold to any individual or family is very limited. This system, which has been enforced in Sweden since about the year 1915, is claimed to be by far the most successful of any system of liquor control. *The element of private profit is taken out of the traffic* by the fact that all profits above interest on investment go to the government treasury, to be used for promoting public welfare through sanitation, education, and other indirect means of combating intemperance. It is claimed that this system would work in the United States because it is very similar in principle to the system of joint state and Federal regulation of railroads, and even to the Federal Reserve Bank system. Members of the Commission who recommended this system held that it is adapted to our system of government and to social and economic conditions in America. It seems to have all of the advantages of government monopoly with very few of its disadvantages.

The Commission as a whole, however, did not approve of the Swedish System, but unanimously recommended a modification of the Eighteenth Amendment to give Congress full power to regulate or to prohibit the liquor traffic. But Congress proposed instead an amendment to the Constitution repealing the Eighteenth Amendment and forbidding the transportation or importation of intoxicating liquor into any state in violation of the laws thereof. This Twenty-first Amendment was ratified by votes of the necessary thirty-six states by December 5, 1933. Thus each of the forty-eight states of the Union has again the power to try any experiments in the regulation of the liquor traffic which it prefers—to prohibit it, or to re-establish the legalized saloon, or to try any desired system of control. Various experiments have been made, but most of our states seem to prefer some system of rigid governmental control, especially for the sale of hard liquors.

Perhaps this discussion of the attempt to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages in the United States by law cannot be concluded better than by the observation that the whole experience emphasizes the necessity of social education in a democracy before

any law therein can be made effective. The weakness of a prohibition law is like the weakness of any other law that fails to reach the evil which it seeks to remedy. No law will be obeyed until the great majority of the people *want* the law obeyed. It is the task of the school and the church to get the people to want just laws and to want to see them obeyed. The prohibition question and the crime question generally show that the deeper problems of social control fall in the field of morals, religion, and education. No law can be effective until it is backed by the convictions of the great mass of the people; and probably no law should be enacted until it has the intelligent support and will of the people behind it. The failure to eliminate crime and vice from civilized society is not evidence that these cannot be eliminated, but rather that the right way to eliminate them has not yet been followed.

A good illustration of modern crime prevention is found in the work of the United States Secret Service. For the first time in history a major law-enforcement agency has adopted a program of crime prevention, with reference to the crime of counterfeiting, through education besides crime suppression by prosecution and imprisonment. By teaching citizens, especially school children, to distinguish good from bad money, it is making the trade of counterfeiters unprofitable. As a consequence, losses to the public through counterfeit money fell in eight years (from 1933 to 1941) 88 per cent. It should always be remembered that ignorance helps to make a fertile ground for crime.

Summary.—This chapter may be summed up, then, by repeating that the problem of crime is in no way an insoluble problem in human society, though, perhaps, a certain amount of occasional and accidental crime will always exist. The solution of the problem, as we have seen, only demands that man should secure the same mastery over his social environment and over human nature that he has already practically achieved over physical nature; and the gradual development of the social sciences will certainly make this possible sometime in the future.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

SUTHERLAND, E. H., *Principles of Criminology*, 3d Ed., Chaps. I-VI.
HAYNES, F. E., *Criminology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. I-IV.
GILLIN, J. L., *Criminology and Penology*, Rev. Ed., Chaps. I-IV.
GILLETTE, J. M., and REINHARDT, J. M., *Problems of a Changing Social Order*, Chaps. 27, 28.

For more extended reading:

BARNES, H.E., *Society in Transition*, Chaps. XVI-XVII.
BARNES, H. E., *The Repression of Crime.*
BOIES, H. M., *The Science of Penology.*
BURT, C., *The Young Delinquent.*
CANTOR, N. F., *Crime and Society.*
FERRI, E., *Criminal Sociology* (translation of 1917).
FLEXNER, B., and BALDWIN, R. N., *Juvenile Courts and Probation.*
FORD, J., *Social Problems and Social Policy*, Part V.
FOSDICK, R. B., *American Police Systems*, Chap. I.
GAULT, R. H., *Criminology.*
GLUECK, S. S., *Five Hundred Criminal Careers.*
GLUECK, S. S., *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents.*
HEALY, W., *The Individual Delinquent.*
HEALY, W., and BRONNER, A. F., *Delinquents and Criminals: Their Making and Unmaking.*
LOMBROSO, C., *Crime, Its Causes and Remedies.*
MORRISON, W. D., *Juvenile Offenders.*
PARMELEE, M., *Criminology*, Chaps. I-VIII.
PARSONS, P. A., *Crime and the Criminal.*
RECKLESS, W., and SMITH, M., *Juvenile Delinquency.*
SHAW, C., *Delinquency Areas.*
SHAW, C., *The Jack-Roller.*
SULLENGER, T. E., *Social Determinants in Juvenile Delinquency.*
THRASHER, F. M., *The Gang.*
WINES, F. H., *Punishment and Reformation*, New and Rev. Ed., 1919.
WOOD, A. E., and WAITE, J. B., *Crime and Its Treatment.*
Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology.

Reports of National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Reports 3-14.
Uniform Crime Reports, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Brief Bibliography on the Liquor Problem:

Committee of Fifty, *The Liquor Problem: A Summary of Investigations.*
EMERSON, H., *Alcohol and Man.*
FISHER, I., *Prohibition at Its Worst.*
FOSDICK, R. B., and SCOTT, W. L., *Toward Liquor Control.*
National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on the Enforcement of Prohibition Laws of the United States.*
ROWNTREE and SHERWELL, *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform.*
WARNER, H. S., *Social Welfare and the Liquor Problem.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What is crime? How would you define the criminal?
2. How should criminals be classified psychologically? What is the simplest basis for such classification? Is such classification important for the treatment of criminals?
3. What do the criminal statistics of the United States show? Give details.
4. Discuss the principal objective causes of crime.
5. Discuss the principal subjective causes of crime.
6. Is any one cause to be regarded as dominant? Are the subjective causes reducible to the objective?
7. Show that there is a relation between physical degeneracy and crime. Illustrate.
8. How can heredity affect criminality? Illustrate.
9. What was Lombroso's theory of crime? Criticize it in detail.
10. Is it possible to do away with crime? How?
11. What different kinds of institutions should be included in a rational prison system?
12. What substitutes for imprisonment can be successfully employed, and under what conditions? Illustrate.

13. How does the study of poverty and crime show the need of a more adequate system of social control in modern society?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the extent of crime in the United States? in Great Britain?
2. Is criminality mainly due to natural tendencies in the individual or to social conditions?
3. What is the relation of criminal habits to poverty? to vice? to law and government? to moral ideals? to religion?
4. Can crime be prevented by changes in these social conditions and by the proper education of individuals?
5. Can the criminal be reformed? If so, under what conditions?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Has every community, in general, the number of criminals which it makes (by tolerating certain crime-producing conditions)?

CHAPTER XVI

MARXIAN SOCIALISM IN THE LIGHT OF SOCIOLOGY

THERE have been proposed many "short cuts" to the solution of social problems. Among these the various schemes for reorganizing human society and industry, brought together under the general name of "socialism," have attracted most attention and deserve most serious consideration. In criticizing the most conspicuous of these schemes of social reconstruction, Marxian or "scientific" socialism, it should be understood at the outset that there is no intention of questioning the general aims of socialists. Those aims, as voiced by their best representatives, are in entire accord with sound science, religion, and ethics. That humanity should gain collective control over the conditions of its existence is the ultimate and highest aim of all science, all education, and all government. No student of sociology doubts that human society has steadily moved, though with interruptions, toward a larger control over its own processes; and no sane man doubts that such collective control over the conditions of existence is desirable. These general aims, which the socialists share with all workers for humanity, are not in question. What is in question is the social philosophy which lies back of revolutionary socialism and also the methods by which it proposes to solve the social problem. In order to criticize socialism we must see a little more exactly what socialism is, both in the narrow and in the broader senses, and what it proposes to do.

Socialism Defined.—Mr. Stuart Chase has recently said, "Scientific progress has made the revolutionary theories of Marx as obsolete as bleeding in medical practice." But such an optimistic conclusion must be doubted. The poverty and distress which will follow World

War II among practically all peoples will probably lead to the trying of many socialistic schemes. The student must remember, however, that socialism is a term which has come to have no definite meaning. It is used by many kinds of people to cover all sorts of vague and indefinite schemes to improve or revolutionize society. In the broadest sense, however, socialism may perhaps be defined as a political and economic program which aims at the public ownership of all or of a majority of income-producing property. It will be sufficient to discuss here at length only one such program—the program of Marxian socialism. This is the sense most frequently attached to the term socialism. Prior to World War I, Marx's theories dominated practically all socialist parties of both continental Europe and America. Thus the theories of the Communists of Russia, who brought about the Russian revolution, were those of radical Marxian socialism. Marxian socialism would seek to solve the social problem by means of a proletarian revolution to put the ownership and management of the means of production (capital) in the hands of the working classes. More moderate forms of socialism, however, aim at a gradual realization of the following program: (1) the common ownership of the means of production (land and principal industries); (2) common management of the means of production (industry) by democratically selected authorities; (3) distribution of the product by these common authorities in accordance with some democratically approved principle; (4) private property in incomes (consumption goods) to be retained.

Marxian socialism, however, does not stop with this political and economic program, but develops a whole social philosophy, which has perhaps been more widely taught than any other. It is for this reason that we are concerned with it here. Briefly this social philosophy advocates (1) "economic determinism," (2) the class struggle view of history, and (3) a cataclysmic theory of social evolution.

The Theoretical Basis of Marxian Socialism.—Marxian socialism is frequently called scientific socialism, because its followers believe that it rests upon a scientific theory of social evolution. This

theory is best stated in Marx's own words, as he gives it in his *Critique of Political Economy*, namely, that "the method of the production of the material life determines the social, political, and spiritual life process in general." We find it stated in other words, though in substance the same, by Engels, Marx's friend and coworker. Engels says, "In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization *necessarily* following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch." In other words, according to Marx and his followers, the economic element in human society determines all other elements; if the other elements cannot be fully derived from the economic, their form and expression at least are determined by the economic. This is the so-called "materialistic conception of history" upon which Marxian socialists believe their program to have a firm scientific foundation.[1] The followers of Marx, indeed, declare that with this principle Marx explains social evolution quite as fully as Darwin explained organic evolution through natural selection; and they do not hesitate to compare Marx's work in the social sciences with Darwin's work in the biological sciences.

It may certainly be agreed that this social philosophy, which is best characterized as "economic determinism," is the logically necessary foundation of Marxian socialism. If the change of the economic or industrial order of human society is going to work such wonders as the Marxists claim, then it must follow that the economic element is the fundamental and determining element in the social life. If what is wrong with human society is chiefly wrong economic conditions, then the changing of those conditions should, of course, change the whole social superstructure. It would seem, therefore, that the dominantly economic program of Marxian socialists must stand or fall with the economic interpretation of social organization and evolution which

[1]In several utterances of his later years Marx qualified considerably his "materialistic conception of history," but the more radical or revolutionary wing of his followers have always adhered to the extreme form of the theory.

Marx proposed. If it can be shown that an economic philosophy of society is essentially unsound, then the proposition to regenerate human society simply by economic reorganization is also unsound. Let us see whether the positions of the Marxian socialists are tenable in the light of the sociological principles which have been emphasized in the previous chapters of this book.

Criticism of Marxian Socialism.—The student has already seen clearly that human society is a complex of living organisms, responding now this way, now that, to external stimuli in the environment. These stimuli in the environment have been roughly, but not quite accurately, spoken of as causes, though they are not causes in a mechanical sense. The responses which are given to these stimuli by individuals and groups vary greatly according to heredity, "instincts," and habits,—the inner nature, in other words, of the organisms composing society. Now, the stimuli in the environment which give rise to the activities of individuals and societies, though not in any mechanical way, may be classified into several great groups, such as the economic, the reproductive, the political, the religious, and so on. The economic stimuli would be those that have to do with the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of wealth; that is, the economic stimuli are those which are concerned with economic values. Now, while the student has been barely introduced to the psychological theory of human society, he probably knows enough of individual human nature to see that there is no reason in the nature of things why one's responses to economic stimuli, those connected with economic values, should determine his response to all other stimuli; and this is what scientific sociology and scientific psychology exactly find; namely, that *there is no reason for believing that economic stimuli determine in any exact way, or to any such extent as Marx thought, responses to other stimuli.* It is true that our habits of response to a certain class of stimuli affect to a certain extent our habits of response to all other classes. Thus it follows that the economic phase of human society affects to a very great degree all other phases of human society. But this is simply the doctrine of the unity of personality and the

interdependence of all phases of the social life, and it is very different from Marx's theory that the economic determines all the other phases; for under the doctrine of social interdependence we can see it is quite as reasonable to state that the religious and political phases of the social life determine the economic as it is to state that the economic determines the political and religious.

Let us bring the discussion down to more concrete terms. The student has seen that in every social problem there are a multitude of factors or stimuli (causes) at work, and that in no problem is the economic factor so all-important that it may be said that the other factors are simply subsidiary. On the contrary, in such a problem as crime the methods of production and distribution of material goods, while important factors in the problem of crime, in no way determine that problem; and ideal conditions of the production and distribution of wealth would by no means completely solve the problem of crime. So, too, the Negro problem is hardly touched by the question of the forms of industry or the economic organization of society. We might go on with a whole list of social problems and find that in every case the economic factor is no more important than various other factors, and that the economic reorganization of society would in some cases scarcely affect these problems at all. *The social problem, therefore,—the problem of the relations of men to one another—is not simply nor fundamentally an economic problem; rather it is fundamentally a biological and psychological problem,*—if you please, a moral problem.

This brings us to a *second* criticism of socialism, namely, that *it proposes to reorganize human society upon an economic basis, not upon a sociological basis.* The program of the Marxist looks forward to the satisfaction of economic needs, but it has failed to take into account all the requirements for social existence. It would be far more scientific to reorganize society upon the basis of the needs of the family than to reorganize it simply upon the basis of industry. The reproductive process which the Marxian socialists ignore, or leave unregulated almost entirely, is far more important for the continued existence of human society than all its economic processes,—if by the

reproductive process we mean the rearing as well as the birth of offspring; and if by the economic process we mean merely the forms and methods of the production and distribution of material goods.

In other words, the Marxist program leaves the future out of account, and aims simply to satisfy the present generation with a just distribution of material goods. If it could be shown that a just distribution of material goods would insure the future of the race and of civilization, then, of course, the Marxist plea would be made good. But this is just what is doubtful. On the whole, it must be said that the Marxist program is based upon the wishes and desires of the adult, not upon the needs of the child or of the race.

The extreme emphasis which Marxian socialism throws upon economic and industrial conditions in human society is, therefore, not justified by the scientific facts which we know about collective human life. Rather it must be said that this is the vital weakness of Marxian socialism,—that it overemphasizes the economic element. Of course, this is not saying that control over economic conditions is not necessary to collective control over the general conditions of existence, which society is undoubtedly aiming at, but it is saying that conceivably collective control over the social life process might be upon some other basis than the economic. It might emphasize, for example, the health and continuity of the race, or individual moral character, far more than the distribution of economic values. Marxian socialism proposes simply to carry a step further our already predominatingly sensate civilization by frankly recognizing the economic as the basis of all things in the social life. A dominantly economic socialism is, therefore, rightfully judged as materialistic. It is really an expression of the sensate standards of our civilization. When the perspective of life becomes shifted again to the more important biological and spiritual values in life, socialism will lose its dominatingly economic character, or it will cease to exist.

It must be emphasized here that all the material and economic progress of the modern world has not added greatly to the happiness or betterment of man. It is true that material progress is important,

yes, necessary for spiritual progress. But material progress alone does not lead to spiritual progress, and therefore mere material prosperity can never add anything to the real happiness and social betterment of the race. On the contrary, it is possible to conceive of a society in which every one has an economic surplus, a society rolling in wealth, approximately equally divided, and yet one in which human misery in its worst forms of vice and crime, pessimism and self-destruction, prevail. It is an old truth, and one which cannot be too often emphasized, that making men "better-off" does not necessarily make them "better," but the modern socialist often becomes angry when this is mentioned to him. It is therefore a matter of comparative indifference, from the standpoint of the happiness and ultimate survival of the race, whether economic goods are distributed relatively evenly in human society or not. The phrase "comparative indifference" is used here because, of course, no one can be indifferent to the material needs of life, inasmuch as they are the basis of its higher development. But after a certain minimum is assured it is extremely doubtful whether a surplus will be of benefit or not, and this minimum necessary for the higher spiritual development of the social life can be secured through the reform of present society without trying the doubtful social revolution which the socialists advocate.

A *third* criticism of Marxian socialism is that *it stands for the internecine or conflict theory of society.* The implication of Marx's economic determinism is, of course, *an egoistic theory of human nature.* Hence if the economic interests of classes conflict, class war must result. Human history has been nothing but a series of class conflicts, according to the Marxians, and must continue to be such as long as one class controls the means of livelihood of another class. Class war can be abolished, they say, not through ethical ideals of brotherhood, but through the seizure of political power by the dispossessed classes, the abolishment of classes, and equalization of economic conditions for all.

This brings us to a *fourth* criticism of Marxian socialism, that *traditionally Marxian socialism has been revolutionary socialism; it has looked forward to a proletarian revolution, which shall transfer the*

ownership of all capital to the working classes, as the solution of the social problem. In brief, it proposes to invoke the power of one class, the workers, over other classes to secure economic justice. Marx's own formula was "evolution through revolution." As to how this revolution is to be brought about, Marxian socialists differ. Some say through peaceful political means; others say, by force if necessary. Whether brought about peacefully or by force, however, it is evident that if this revolution were suddenly accomplished it is highly uncertain whether its results would be permanent. For all that has been learned concerning human society leads to the conclusion that social organization at any particular time is very largely a matter of habit. Now collective habits are less easily changed than individual habits, because any change in collective habits practically necessitates the consent of all the individuals who make up the social group. Hence groups usually change their "habits," their "mores," slowly. We know also that even in individual life old habits are not easily supplanted by new ones and that there is always a tendency to revert to the old. All historical evidence shows that revolutions are always followed by periods of reaction, and that this reaction is usually proportionate to the extent and suddenness of change in social organization.

Nor is it true that normally social evolution or development takes place through cataclysmic changes—"revolutions." Great social changes have often come about, it is true, suddenly, but if they have been of a progressive character it has been because men have suddenly learned from some crisis. Progressive social changes involve learning by the whole group, and normally they are brought about by public discussion, by the deliberate formation of a public opinion and of a group will. This is usually a gradual process. Profound social changes, in other words, require preparation in individual character and proceed by a series of gradual steps. The slow progress of Christianity and of democracy illustrates this. When social changes are brought about suddenly by the exercise of the power of one class over other classes, the only probable result will be the collapse of the new order

sooner or later because it rests upon insufficient foundations in individual character. Thus a lasting radical social reconstruction by means of revolution is scarcely possible.

The greatest menace of Marxian socialism is its implied threat of force. The logic of Marxian socialism leads straight to revolution by force if its program cannot be realized by peaceful political means. The student can hardly fail to see the close connection between the doctrines of Marxian socialism and the practical program of the Bolshevist party in Russia. Actual war between classes is the natural result of such doctrines. As to revolution by force, sociology can offer but one judgment; namely, that it is the most costly method of change which a nation can employ. It is a justifiable method only when a governing class is hopelessly out of adjustment with its group, when its power is a mere survival blocking the path of progress. Revolution by force is objectionable as a method of social reconstruction because it stimulates so greatly the forces of social disorder. Russia illustrates this; but in a more urban, and so more fragile civilization such as that of the United States, its effect would probably be even more frightful. Moreover, in a democracy, where political power is in the hands of the people, revolution by force is particularly unnecessary and objectionable as a method of change. The method of democracy is government through discussion, the formation of a public opinion, and of a group will; and sociology finds this to be the normal method of social change. The social problem is a problem of right, not of might, and it can be solved only by discussion, rationality, and good will. This is the scientific method of social reconstruction, therefore; and revolution is not.

It is not the place in this book to take up the practical objections to Marxian and other forms of socialism. These practical objections are for the most part of a political and economic nature, and they accordingly can be dealt with better in treatises on politics and economics than in one on sociology. It is perhaps sufficient to note here that in any practical view of the matter the political and economic objections to socialism must be accorded not less weight than the sociological

objections. Government, for example, exists in human society to regulate, and not to carry on directly, social activities. It may carry on successfully certain industries which have been reduced to routine, which require little initiative, or which for public reasons are more conveniently conducted by the state in its various branches. But if under state socialism the state in its various branches or forms were to own and manage all productive industry, it is extremely probable that such an experiment at the present time would break down of its own weight, since the state would be attempting that which, in the nature of things, as the chief regulative institution of society, it is not fitted to do. But this is not the place, as has just been said, to go into the political and economic objections to Marxian or other forms of socialism. To understand these the student must consult the leading works on economic and political science.

Non-Marxian Forms of Socialism.—All that has been said thus far regarding socialism applies only to Marxian socialism. Brief mention must be made of other forms, though their adherents are not nearly so numerous as those of Marxian socialism. The moderate socialists, in general, repudiate economic determinism, the class struggle theory of history, the hedonistic ethics, and the revolutionary methods of Marxian socialism. This is especially true of the moderate English socialists. Such socialism, in other words, disregards the whole social philosophy which has hitherto been made more or less a part of the socialist movement, especially by the Marxians. The moderate socialists limit their socialism to the practical proposal of the ownership and control of a majority of all business by the workers or by society collectively, and the political and economic changes necessitated by such ownership. Moreover, the moderate socialists do not claim that the carrying out of their program would usher in a social millennium or even solve the social problem. They claim that such economic reorganization of society is simply the most important step toward the solution of the social problem.

It must be said that the sociological objections which have been urged against Marxian socialism do not apply as against this moderate

type of socialism which makes itself sponsor for no particular social philosophy. The objections to the program of moderate socialism, in other words, are wholly of a practical nature, and therefore they fall within the realm of economic and political objections, rather than of sociological.

On the other hand, some more extreme forms of socialism than the Marxian type have developed within recent years. These extreme forms of socialism are known on the continent of Europe, generally, as syndicalism. Syndicalism, unlike Marxian socialism, would not rely at all upon political methods, but rather upon the use of such methods as "the general strike," and various forms of violence, such as the destruction of capital. Syndicalism aims at accomplishing its results, in other words, not by peaceful revolution, but by the use of violence, if that is necessary. The syndicalists, however, avow themselves to be socialists, and aim at the co-operative carrying on of industry by groups of workingmen.

Thus we see that socialism tends to divide itself into a moderate group and an extreme group, with the moderate Marxians at the present time occupying a midway position. Whether the socialists will become united in their social philosophy and in their program in the near future it is impossible to say. At present they seem united only in their opposition to the existing order of society and in their common belief in the essential doctrine of socialism, namely, the doctrine of the common ownership and management of the instruments of production.

The Program of Scientific Social Reconstruction.—Certain steps sociology and the social sciences already indicate as necessary for a normal social life. These steps, however, aim not at the destruction of the existing social order, but at removing certain demonstrated causes of social maladjustment which exist in present society; and as in the solution of special social problems we have seen reason to reject "short cuts" and "cure-alls," so in a scientific reconstruction of human society we have good reason to reject the social revolution which the followers of Marx advocate, and to offer as a substitute in its stead

some social reforms which will make more nearly possible a normal social life.

Perhaps the necessary steps for bringing about such a normal social life have never been better summed up than by Edward T. Devine in his book on *Misery and its Causes*. Let us therefore consider a brief résumé of the conditions which Dr. Devine names as essential to normal social life, as these probably offer a program upon which all sane social workers and reformers could unite. Dr. Devine names ten conditions essential to a normal social life: (1) the securing of a sound physical heredity, that is, a good birth for every child, by a rational system of eugenics; (2) the securing of a protected childhood, which will assure the normal development of the child, and of a protected motherhood, which will assure the proper care of the child; (3) a system of education which shall be adapted to social needs, inspired by the ideals of rational living and social service; (4) the securing of freedom from preventable disease; (5) the elimination of professional vice and crime; (6) the securing of a prolonged working period for both men and women; (7) a general system of insurance against the ordinary contingencies of life which now cause poverty or dependence; (8) a liberal relief system which will meet the material needs of those who become accidentally dependent; (9) a minimum standard of life for all, sufficiently high to insure full nourishment, reasonable recreation, proper housing, and the other elementary necessities of life; (10) a social religion which shall make the service of humanity the highest aim of all individuals.

Moreover, these ten essentials of a normal social life are not inconsistent, as Marxian socialism is, with our fundamental democratic social and economic principles, which may be summed up as (1) personal freedom, (2) individual enterprise, and (3) individual responsibility. They are in harmony with the ultimate aim of our democracy, which is an adequate life for all.

It is sufficient to note, in closing this chapter, that these ten essentials of a normal social life can be realized—that there is no reason why they cannot be. The scientific use of taxation is one method by which

the economic inequalities of our present social order can be overcome and a normal social life be made possible for all. The financial experience of World War I suggests the way to secure ample funds for social purposes.

There can be no question that the ultimate aim of the social sciences is to provide society with the knowledge necessary for successful control over its own life-processes. Sociology and the special social sciences are aiming, therefore, in an indirect way to accomplish the same thing which Marxian socialism aims at accomplishing through revolution. There would seem to be no danger in trusting science to work out this problem of collective control over the conditions of existence. There are no risks to run by the scientific method, for it proceeds experimentally, adequately testing theories by facts as it goes along. The thing to do, therefore, for those who wish to see "a humanity adjusted to the requirements of its existence," is to encourage scientific social research along all lines. With a fuller knowledge of human nature and human society it will be possible to indicate sane and safe reconstructions in the social order, so that ultimately humanity will control its social environment and its own human nature even more completely than it now controls the forces of physical nature. But the ultimate reliance in all such reconstruction must be, not revolution, not even legislation, but education—as will be discussed in the following chapter.

World Reconstruction.—World War II has shown that no national program of reconstruction is sufficient to insure human welfare. This is due not simply to the fear of war, however, but to the fear of the world-wide conditions which will probably prevail after a world-wide war. All scientific programs of social reconstruction which are limited to one nation now seem inadequate. We now see that national welfare is necessarily bound up with the welfare of other nations than our own. This brings us to the problem of world reconstruction at the close of World War II—a problem too large for discussion in this text. However, the Rockefeller Foundation has pointed out certain important problems which the postwar world will have to face,

and which, in a sense, are more important than any problems of social adjustment and welfare within a nation. Among these problems are the following:

1. Repair of the vast physical destruction of the war.
2. Re-establishment of international economic life in a shattered world.
3. Organization of international political life to safeguard the peace of the future.
4. Reconciliation of political nationalism with our cultural and economic internationalism.
5. Restoration of tolerance and faith in a world indoctrinated with hate and fear.
6. Efficient organization of government—for legislation and administration in a technical, large-unit world.
7. Readjustment from war economy to peace economy so as to avoid great depressions and their waves of unemployment.

Evidently such problems cannot be solved without world-wide education of people everywhere toward greater economic, political, and social literacy. Moreover, nationalistic passions and prejudices will have to be overcome by such education or by the spread of world-wide humanitarian sentiments. Wise statesmanship and wise social leadership are needed as they never were before in world history. As someone has said, the great tragedy of our time is that we are citizens of the world and do not know it.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *Man's Social Destiny*, Chap. IV.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Christianity and Social Science*, Chap. VI.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Reconstruction of Religion*, Chap. VIII.

For more extended reading:

BERNSTEIN, E., *Evolutionary Socialism.*
DAVIS, J., *Contemporary Social Movements*, Bks. III, IV.

ELY, R. T., *Socialism and Social Reform.*
GUYOT, Y., *Socialistic Fallacies.*
HOOVER, C. B., *Economic Life of Soviet Russia.*
JOHNSON, H., *The Soviet Power: the Socialist Sixth of the World.*
KIRKUP, J., *History of Socialism.*
LAIDLER, H. W., *History of Socialist Thought.*
MCDONALD, J. R., *The Socialist Movement*, Chaps. VI-IX.
SCUDDER, V. D., *Socialism and Character.*
SPARGO, J., *Socialism*, Rev. Ed.
SPARGO, J., *Bolshevism.*
WELLS, H. G., *New Worlds for Old.*

On Syndicalism:

BROOKS, *American Syndicalism.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. What is socialism? What is Marxian socialism? What is communism?
2. State the philosophy of Marxian socialism and criticize it both as a theory of social evolution and as a program of social reconstruction.
3. State the theory of "economic determinism" both in its Marxian and in its recent forms. Criticize it in detail both as a theory of social evolution and as a theory of progress.
4. What bearing does your criticism of "economic determinism" have upon Marxian or "orthodox" socialism? Does it affect equally the program of non-Marxian forms of socialism? What is the relation of Marxian socialism to Bolshevism?
5. What other sociological errors are embodied in the doctrines of Marxian socialism? Why are they errors?
6. What truths are embodied in the economic theory of progress which sociologists and social workers need to take into account?
7. Outline the necessary steps which must be taken for scientific social reconstruction. Are these consistent with democracy?
8. Has sociology taught you anything about the solution of international social problems? How would you proceed to establish enduring peace among the nations?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the program of socialism? Of Marxian socialism?
2. What is the social philosophy of Marxian socialism? Can you criticize it?
3. Is revolution a safe way to attempt to bring about social reforms? If not, why not?
4. Would a government by manual workers and the public ownership of major industries insure the solution of the major problems of human relations? If not, why not?
5. Assuming general social and political education, what would be a scientific program of social reconstruction?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should governments own and operate the mines and oil wells?

CHAPTER XVII

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

As was said in the preceding chapter, the ultimate reliance in all social reform or social reconstruction must be upon the education of the individual. Social organization can never be more complex or of a higher type than is permitted by the individual character and intelligence of the members of the group. *At any given stage of society*, therefore, *the intelligence and moral character of its individual members limit social organization.* Only by raising the intelligence and character of the individual members of society can a higher type of social life permanently result.

Another fact, following from the above, to which the student should give his attention is that all progress in human society depends upon the relation between one generation and its successor. Only as new life comes into society is there opportunity to improve the character of that life. If at any given time intelligence and character limit the possibilities of social organization, then it is equally manifest that only in the new individuals of society can that intelligence and character be greatly improved.

There are, of course, two possible ways of bringing about such improvement:—first, through the selection of the hereditary elements in society, eliminating the unfit and preserving the more fit; but, as has been repeatedly pointed out, such a scheme of artificial selection is far in the future, and in any case its inauguration would have to depend upon the *second* method of improving individual character, which is through education and training. As already shown in this book, not only may the natural impulses and tendencies of individuals be greatly modified by training, but through education the habits and hence the character of individuals can be controlled. Therefore

the main reliance of society in all forward movements must be upon education, that is, upon artificial means of controlling the formation of character and habit in individuals.

The finality of education in social betterment can be, perhaps, further illustrated by reconsidering for a moment some of the social problems which we have just studied. Take for example the problem of crime. There are only three possible means, as we have already seen, of eliminating crime from human society:—first, through changes in individual human nature, brought about by biological selection, that is, through a system of selective breeding, eliminating all who show any criminal tendencies. This method would, perhaps, eliminate certain types of criminals as we have already seen, namely, those in whom hereditary defects which lead to crime are dominant. A second means of attacking the problem of crime would be by improving social and economic conditions through the interference of the organized authority of society in the form of the state. Legislation and administration directed to social ends might accomplish much in reducing the temptations and opportunities for crime in any group. The correction of evils in social and industrial organization would, no doubt, again greatly lessen crime but it is entirely conceivable, from all that we know of human nature and human society, that crime might still persist under a just social and industrial organization. Crime could be completely eliminated only through a third means, namely, the careful training of each new individual in society as he comes on the stage of life, so that he would be moral and law-abiding, respecting the rights of others and the institutions of society. Moreover, neither selective breeding nor governmental interference in social conditions could accomplish very much in eliminating crime unless these were backed by a wise system of social education.

Now what is true of crime is equally true of all social problems. They may be approached from any of three sides:—first, from the biological side, or the side of physical heredity; second, from the side of social organization, or the improvement of the social environment; third, from the side of individual character, or the psychical adjust-

ment of the individual to society. As Professor Ward and many other sociologists have emphasized, it is this third side which is the most available point of attack on all social problems; for when we have secured a right attitude of the individual toward society all social problems will be more than half solved. Thus, as was said at the beginning of this book, education has a bearing upon every social problem, and every social problem also has a bearing upon education. Just how important this reciprocal relationship between education and social life is, we can appreciate only when we have considered somewhat more fully the nature of social progress.

The Nature of Social Progress.—Social progress has been defined in many ways by the social thinkers of the past. Without entering into any formal definition of social progress, it is evident that social progress consists in learning better ways of doing and of living. It brings greater control on the part of man over physical nature, on the one hand, and over human nature and human relations, on the other. Hence it means increasing control over all the conditions of life. We regard those things as progressive, whether they be moral, intellectual, or material, which bring about a better adjustment of individuals to one another in society, and of man to physical nature. The goal of human progress is complete mastery, complete control, over all of the conditions of existence. Well-balanced progress means, therefore, that man comes into increasing harmony with his own nature, with his fellow men, and with physical nature. It gives man greater efficiency in performing physical work, because he utilizes the laws of physical nature. It gives him greater ability to survive, because he knows how to control both nature and himself. Finally, it brings about greater harmony in human relations, because it gives control over human behavior.

Now it is evident that progress in this sense of increasing control over physical nature and over human behavior depends mainly upon two things, the increase of knowledge and the increase of good will among men. It is further evident that these can be brought about only through training the intelligence and the moral character of

individuals. Heredity and biological conditions may count, but they also can be controlled only through increasing knowledge and good will. Therefore, the whole question of progress turns upon the question of education. If we wish to bring about progress in human society in a rational, deliberate way, we can do so only through a rational program of education. To be sure, men have often learned in the past better ways of living through the hard lessons of experience, sometimes through disasters and calamities. But there is a better way of learning to solve the problems of life, and that is through the scientific method of rationally planned education which will fit individuals to solve their problems through scientific knowledge, rather than by mere trial and error, or "muddling" through them. The key to social progress is evidently an education which will give man an understanding of how he can control himself, his civilization or culture, and physical nature; and which will at the same time supply him with motives to utilize this knowledge. The key, in other words, is rational *social* education.

The whole matter becomes simple as soon as we understand that progress, both for the individual and for society, depends upon the learning process, and is not automatic. It is, therefore, a matter of taking thought, of effort, and of education. But education may be misdirected or may be ill-balanced. The problem involved in education, if we wish to make education a means to progress, is to find just the sort of education which is needed. Evidently an education which overemphasizes the value of the past will not favor progress. Again, an education which stresses too much the physical sciences or the control of physical nature, while it may lead to great progress in materialistic ways, will not favor progress in social and moral ways. If we want balanced progress, we must have balanced education, with social education, the education of the individual for his human relations, as the core of the educational process.

The Social Function of Education.—We are now prepared to understand the meaning of educational systems in civilized society and to see what the true function of education is. Education exists

to adjust individuals to their social life. It is for the purpose of fitting the individual to take his place in the social group and to add something to the life of the group. Educational systems exist not to train the individual to develop his powers and capacity simply as an individual unit, but rather to fit him effectively to carry on the social life before he actively participates in it. In other words, the social function of education is to guide and control the formation of habit and character on the part of the individual, as well as to develop his capacity and powers, so that he shall become an efficient member of society. This work is not, at least in complex civilizations such as our own, one which we carry on simply in order to achieve social perfection, but it is rather something which is necessary for the survival of large and complex groups. Otherwise, as has been pointed out, the conflicts resulting from the acquired habits and character of individuals would be so great that there would be no possibility of their working together harmoniously in a common social life. Just so far as the system of education is defective, is insufficient to meet social needs, in so far may we expect the production of individuals who are socially maladjusted, as shown in pauperism, defectiveness, and crime.

Education is, then, the great means of controlling habit and character in complex social groups, and as such it is the chief means to which society must look for all substantial social progress. It is the instrument by which human nature may be apparently indefinitely modified, and hence, also, the instrument by which society may be perfected. The task of social regeneration is essentially a task of education.

Education as a Factor in Past Social Evolution.—Does past social history justify these large claims for education as a factor in social development? The correct answer is that the history of human society undoubtedly substantiates this position, but even if it did not, we should still have good grounds for claiming that education can be such an all-powerful factor in the social future. The sociological study of past civilizations, however, shows quite conclusively that all of them have depended in one way or another upon educational

processes, not only for continuity, but largely, also, for their development. As we have already seen, the life history of a culture or a civilization is frequently the life history of a religion. But religious beliefs, together with the moral and social beliefs which become attached to them, were effectively transmitted only through the instruction of the young. The religious element did scarcely more than afford a powerful sanction for the moral and social beliefs upon which the social organization of the past rested; hence, when we ascribe great importance to the religious factor in social evolution, we also ascribe, at the same time, great importance to education, because it was essentially the educational process, together with religious sanction, which made possible most of the civilizations and social progress of the past.

Indeed, we have no record of any people of any very considerable culture that did not employ educational processes to the largest degree to preserve and transmit that culture from generation to generation. Culture has been passed down in human history, therefore, essentially by educational processes. These educational processes have controlled the formation of habits and character, of ways of thinking and ways of acting, in successive generations of individuals. The educational processes have had much more to do, therefore, with the civilizations and social organization of the past than industrial conditions. Industrial conditions have been rather relatively external factors in the social environment to which society has had to adapt itself more or less. In the same way, political authority has rested on, and been derived from, the social traditions rather than the reverse. It is therefore not too much for the sociologist to say, agreeing with Thomas Davidson, that education is the last and highest method of social evolution. The lowest method of evolution was by selection, and *that*, as has been already emphasized, cannot be neglected. The next method of social evolution apparently to develop was the method of adaptation by despotic authority, and, as we have already seen, organized authority in society, or social regulation by means of authority, must indefinitely persist and perhaps increase, rather than

diminish; but the latest and highest method of social evolution is not through biological selection nor through the exercise of despotic authority, but through the education of the individual, so that he shall become adjusted to the social life in habits and character before he participates in it. *Human society may be modified*, we now see, *best through modifying the nature of the individual, and the most direct method to do this is through education.*

The Socialized Education of the Future.—If what has been said is substantially correct, then education should become conscious of its social mission and purpose. The educator should develop education as the chief means of social progress, and education should be directed to producing efficient and socially intelligent members of society. The education of the future must aim, in other words, not at producing lawyers, physicians, engineers, but at producing citizens. Education for citizenship means that there must be radical reconstruction in the educational processes of the present. The education of the nineteenth century aimed at developing largely power and capacity in the individual as such. Its implicit, and oftentimes its avowed, aim was individual success. The popularity of higher education in the nineteenth century especially rested upon the cult of individual success. It became, therefore, largely commercialized, and emphasized chiefly the professions and occupations which best assured the individual a successful career among a commercial and industrial people.

It is needless to say that the individualistic, commercialized education of the latter years of the nineteenth century very often failed to produce the good citizen. On the contrary, with its ideal of individual power and success, it frequently produced the cultured freebooter, of whom our modern industry has so often afforded examples. Education, instead of being a socializing agency and the chief instrument of social regeneration, became an individualizing agency dissolving the social order itself. It is this education which in part produced our present social problems.

Very slowly our educators are becoming conscious of the fact that this type of education is a social menace, and that our educational

system needs reformation from bottom to top in order to become again equal to the social task imposed upon it by the more complex social conditions of the twentieth century. Hence the demand for a socialized education, which is proceeding, not only from sociologists and social workers, but from the progressive leaders of education itself.

What the socialized education of the future should be can here be outlined only in its more essential and general characteristics. The curriculum is the vital thing in education, and the consideration of what sort of curriculum is demanded by the social situation, from elementary school to university, will perhaps serve better to define socialized education than would a formal definition.

First of all, let us recall that in man the chief organ of adjustment, both in his physical and in his social life, is the mind. The freeing of the mind, the development of its powers, and the disciplining of it to social use have been, in general, the fundamental aim of modern education; and this aim a socialized education would fully reaffirm. Only it would throw the accent upon the social purpose involved in this aim. Through the freeing of the mind, the development of its powers, and the disciplining of these to social use, a social life which is plastic, adaptable, and *progressive* is practically assured. Hence a socialized education means, first of all, a liberalizing and liberating education of the mind; and subjects which are especially adapted to achieve this end should receive primary consideration.

Secondly, a socialized education will aim at the diffusion of definite social information. We cannot solve our social problems without more social intelligence; and the surest way to secure social intelligence is to have more social and political education in our schools. We live in a social world more than in a world of material objects. Our chief adjustments must be made to men and to institutions, not to things. Human relationships, in other words, make or mar the world we know. They count for more in human happiness than everything else put together. We can no longer trust common sense to adjust the individual to this world of human relationships; for our civilization has become such a complex system of relationships that no one

can play his part in it well without a very considerable amount of general and specific social information. Therefore, the study of the relations of men to one another must be the essential element in a system of social education. Such studies as history, government, economics, ethics, and sociology must occupy a larger place in the education of the future if we are to secure a humanity adjusted to the requirements of its existence.

Moreover, many new experiments are being tried throughout our civilization which depend for their success upon a general diffusion of social intelligence. Democracy is such an experiment. The attempt to establish democracy without providing adequate social and political education for the mass of citizens must result in disaster. If we want democracy to succeed, we must educate for democracy. It is treason to our democratic institutions to send forth from our schools young men and women who know little or nothing of the responsibility, duties, and privileges of citizens in a democracy, and of the social conditions and ideals which are necessary for the success of democratic society. In a socialized education, then, social and political studies will occupy the most conspicuous place in the curriculum.

All this implies that the older idea that education can be given regardless of content is, from the social point of view, a great mistake. Social knowledge is necessary for intelligent and efficient social service, and education should have efficiency in service as its chief end. Therefore, sociological knowledge in the broadest sense should be required in the education of every citizen, and particularly of those who are to become social leaders. Lester F. Ward has ably argued that if sufficient information of the facts, conditions, and laws of human society could be given to all, that alone would bring about in the highest degree social progress. Whether we agree or not that the mere giving of information will of itself lead to progressive or dynamic action in society, it must be admitted that right social information is indispensable for right social action. As Charles H. Cooley has said, "We live in a system, and to achieve right ends, or any rational ends whatever, we must learn to understand that system."

Hence, the commanding place which sociology and the social sciences should occupy in the education of all classes.

In the higher education, the social sciences should be especially emphasized, because it is those who receive higher education who become the leaders of society, and it is important, no matter what occupation or profession they may serve society in, that they understand the bearings of their work upon social welfare. They must know their duties as citizens and understand how society may best be served. In other words, our higher education should put to the front the ideal, not of individual power and success, but of social service; and this means that, in addition to the technical or professional education which the more highly educated are given, there must be given them a sufficient knowledge of social conditions, of the laws and principles of social progress, to enable them to serve society rightly. Intelligent social service, we must remember, cannot exist without social knowledge.

But a socialized education cannot stop with the giving of mere information regarding social facts. Its *third* task will be to point out and seek to inculcate valid social values, standards, and ideals, as soon as adequate scientific knowledge of social facts has been ascertained on which to base scientific social standards and ideals. Thus as soon as we have ascertained the conditions and effects of such a matter as child labor, we have the knowledge on which we can base and inculcate a scientific standard regarding it. If this were not so, social education would be useless. The approach to moral education must be through the social sciences. Morality cannot be taught as an abstraction. The trouble with most of the instruction in morality in our schools in the past is that it has been divorced from the facts of our social life. If we will base such instruction upon scientific social knowledge, we can as readily inculcate ideals regarding government, law, sanitation, family life, business, and human relations generally as we can standards of vocational excellence.

Socialized education means, then, moral education; for it means education into social, national, and humanitarian ideals; not simply

into those ideals as they are, but as they ought to be in the light of full knowledge regarding human relations. It will aim, not simply at the development of the individual, but "to create social solidarity by means of a social type marked by service." It will lead directly to that consecration of life to the service of humanity which is the essence of true religion.

Fourthly, socialized education will make adequate provision for the vocational training of every citizen, no matter how poor he may be. To be a good citizen or to serve humanity at large, one must be usually self-supporting, must find one's work in the world, and be able to do it well. We are beginning to perceive that the service ideal of life demands that everybody in normal health be occupied at some useful work, and that in a democracy there is no place for a class of idlers. Moreover, we are also beginning to perceive that all service, all constructive labor, is of social value, and perhaps more nearly of equal social worth than we had supposed. Socialized education would of course be a failure if it did not culminate in the individual's finding his life work, his proper vocation in society.

But enthusiasts in vocational education have often made one of two mistakes. First, they have often wished to vocationalize the whole educational system, or to place specialized vocational training too early in the curriculum. But specialized vocational training should come at the end of a socialized curriculum, not at its beginning; it should be its crown, not its foundation. Preceding all vocational education should come the liberation of the mind, the understanding of social facts, and the appreciation of social values. The second mistake which some enthusiasts for vocational education make is that they confuse it with socialized education in general. But *vocationalization* is only a part of the process of *socialization*. To mistake the part for the whole would be an unpardonable error, for it would land us in worse difficulties than before. An efficient lawyer, or farmer, or engineer, the common experience of life shows, is not necessarily a good citizen. To think that good citizenship consists simply in vocational excellence is to misconceive the whole nature of the social

life and of socialized education. Technical education obviously can be made safe for democracy and higher civilization only by attaching it to a general program of socialized education. A large part of our school work and of our undergraduate work in college should therefore be kept free from vocational training. We must, however, have a system of vocational education, open even to the child of the humblest citizen, as the crown of our whole educational system; but we must never forget that all men in a democracy are citizens first before they are members of any calling, trade, or profession.

Of course, much more is involved in the socialization of education than these changes in the curriculum. The teacher, for example, must have the social point of view and be imbued with the spirit of social service. The teacher should realize that he is a social creator and that, at bottom, his work is nothing less than the shaping of the social future. But the attitude of teachers goes back largely to the training they have received in the high schools, colleges, and universities. It is upon these latter that the responsibility must rest for socializing our education and making it a conscious agency of social reconstruction; for they train the teachers and the educational leaders. It is not the purpose of this chapter, however, to trace in detail all that is involved in the socialization of education, but rather merely to point out the essential marks of a socialized education and the need of it as the only basis for enduring social progress.

Summary on Education and Social Reconstruction.—Social education is the foundation and essential means of all other methods of social reconstruction in a democracy. It is the distinctive method of social evolution in its higher, more conscious phases, and is the chief means by which human society can perfect itself. But social education must be scientific, that is, it must diffuse knowledge of social facts and laws and of methods by which social evils may be overcome. It must also be imbued with the humanitarian spirit, taking the ideal of social service as its chief end. Such social education, as a foundation for progressive policies along every line, is the only way out in our civilization. It alone can transform our "mores"

into those of a higher humanitarian civilization. It will insure the development of true moral freedom in our social life; for social science implies searching but impersonal criticism of social institutions and public policies. It will check the exaggerated individualism which hitherto, as we have seen, has been one of the most menacing tendencies of our civilization; for social education will show the solidarity of society and the interdependence of all its parts. Finally, it will lessen the practical materialism of modern civilization; for it will throw emphasis upon the importance of spiritual values in the relations of men to one another. The social sciences, aiming at the control of social conditions and of social progress, necessarily emphasize the higher life of man, and they therefore set before the student the goal of the service of mankind.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

ELLWOOD, C. A., *Man's Social Destiny*, Chap. V.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Social Problem*, Rev. Ed., 1919, Chap. VI.
FINNEY, R. L., *A Sociological Philosophy of Education*, Chaps. II-III, VI-IX.
TODD, A. J., *Theories of Social Progress*, Chap. XXXIII.

For more extended reading:

BAGLEY, W. C., *Educational Values.*
BAGLEY, W. C., *The Educative Process.*
BEAR, R. M., *The Social Functions of Education.*
BETTS, G. H., *Social Principles of Education.*
CLOW, F. R., *Principles of Educational Sociology.*
COOK, L. A., *Community Backgrounds of Education.*
COUNTS, G. S., *The American Road to Culture.*
DEWEY, J., *Democracy and Education.*
GOOD, A., *Sociology and Education.*
GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems and Education.*
HART, H. N., *The Technique of Social Progress*, Chaps. I, XXVIII-XXIX.
KILPATRICK, W. H., *Source Book in the Philosophy of Education.*

KING, I., *Education for Social Efficiency.*
KINNEMAN, J. A., *Society and Education.*
PAYNE, E. G., *Readings in Educational Sociology*, Vol. I.
PETERS, C. C., *Foundations of Educational Sociology*, Rev. Ed.
ROBBINS, C. L., *The School as a Social Institution.*
ROUCEK, J. S., *Sociological Foundations of Education.*
SMITH, W. R., *An Introduction to Educational Sociology.*
SNEDDEN, D., *Educational Sociology.*
WARD, L. F., *Applied Sociology*, Chaps. VIII-XII.
WARD, L. F., *Dynamic Sociology*, Vol. II, Chap. XIV.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. Why are the intelligence and character of the individual so important in human social life?
2. What is the nature of social progress?
3. What has been the function of education in past social and cultural evolution?
4. Do you agree that education is the highest and final method of social evolution? Why?
5. What is a socialized education? Illustrate fully.
6. What do you think is the essential part of a socialized education? Give *reasons* for your opinion.
7. Is social reconstruction without general social education possible? Why not?

For classroom discussion:

1. What is the relation between social organization and the intelligence and character of the individuals of a group?
2. Has any human society ever existed which did not employ education, either informal or formal, as a means of social control?
3. What do we mean by social progress?
4. From the standpoint of our social needs, what would be an adequately socialized system of education in our schools today?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should the United States have an integrated national system of education?

CHAPTER XVIII[1]

THEORETICAL SUMMARY

LET us now try briefly to summarize the theoretical principles which have been more or less brought out in the discussions of the preceding chapters. Of course, for any adequate treatment of the principles of social organization and evolution, the student must turn to the standard texts on sociological theory. This book, however, would be incomplete without directing the student's attention, in some measure at least, to the theoretical principles implied in the concrete discussions.

The Origin of Society.—Earlier chapters have tried to show that society is something which has sprung from the very processes of life itself. It is not something which has been invented by individuals. On the contrary, life, in its higher forms at least, could not exist without association. The processes of both nutrition and reproduction in all higher forms of life involve a necessary interdependence among organisms of the same species. From the very beginning of the higher forms of life, the association of the sexes has been necessary for reproduction and for the care and rearing of offspring. Likewise, some degree of association has always been necessary for the procuring of an adequate food supply and for protection against enemies. Thus, society has grown spontaneously out of the necessities of the life process. It has grown out of both of the fundamental phases of the life process, the food process and the reproductive process. No greater error could be made in sociology, therefore, than to assume that society is the result of the coming together of individuals developed in isolation. On the contrary, society, in the sense of a group of organisms carrying on a common life by means of mental interaction,

[1]In a brief course of study this chapter may be omitted.

is an expression of the original and continuing unity of the life process of the associating organisms. While the interaction of individual organisms in its lowest phases was probably purely physical, yet it was out of such interaction that the mental interaction which we call association, or society, arose.

Control over food supply necessitated association among animals because a food supply can be more easily secured by groups of co-operating individuals than by isolated individuals. Natural selection operated, therefore, from the beginning of animal life, in favor of groups and toward the elimination of individuals living relatively isolated. Moreover, it would especially favor those groups in which the interaction between individuals was quick and sure; in other words, those in which the powers of mental interstimulation and response were developed. It is not an accident, therefore, that the most successful, and, in general, the higher animals, live in groups.

Such collective control over the food process established primarily by natural selection becomes one of the great bases for social organization, and in humanity such association for providing food supply has given rise to society's industrial institutions.

Defense against enemies has been, of course, another phase of the life process which has favored the development of association. Really, however, this is very largely the negative side of the food process. It needs no argument to show that such defense can be much better undertaken by groups of individuals than by isolated individuals, and that natural selection, therefore, must have operated all along in this way to favor group life.

However, the activities connected with nutrition have probably not played so large a part in the genesis of association as the activities connected with reproduction. The birth and care of offspring are essential phases of life, and in all but the lowest forms of life they involve the co-operation of at least two individuals. In our study of the family, we have seen how sexual reproduction and parental care gave rise to the family group. We have also seen the great part which

the family group has played in producing all other forms of association. All of the great regulative and moral institutions in humanity, for example, seem to have had their origin, more or less, in the life of the family group. There is no doubt that society, in the intimate and sympathetic sense, had its beginnings in the family, especially in the relation of the child to the mother.

The Origin of Human Society. We saw in Chapters I and II that there are vast differences between human society and animal groups. On account of man's higher intelligence and greater capacity to learn, man invents not only physical tools, but institutions. Therefore, the artificial element in human relations, the product of man's achievements, becomes much greater than in any animal group. Indeed, the accumulation of these achievements has given mankind a distinct phase of evolution, cultural evolution, not found in the animal world below man. Men have come to live in their societies mainly by their culture, by what they have learned from their experience as to how they should live with nature and with their fellow men.

We must not conclude that human society is either a purely natural or a purely artificial construction. Human institutions, for the most part, have not had a premeditated, reflective origin but have sprung up spontaneously from the needs of life for food, reproduction, and defense. But the method of meeting these needs has been greatly modified by human intelligence, especially as these have become embodied in social traditions and customs. Many institutions have developed down to the present time with but little premeditated guidance. Nevertheless, with the development of culture, intelligent purposes have played an increasingly important part in the construction of institutions and in the modification of human relations. Because intelligent purposes have become increasingly influential in controlling human conduct, there is good ground for believing that they can play a controlling part in the human future. But it is evident that human society is modifiable only in the same sense and in the same degree in which human nature is modifiable. Human society is not a contract, as was once thought, but neither is it a machine of

divine creation which human intelligence cannot modify. Perhaps the most important conclusion which can be reached by the beginning student of sociology is that all problems of human relations, so far as we can discover, seem subject to control, and possibly to solution, by the development of culture or civilization. This is what gives hope for the human future.

The Nature of Human Social Behavior.—We saw in Chapter III that so far as there is a single key to understanding the social behavior of man it lies in the concepts of culture and social tradition. It is the sociological fact of the power of group traditions which makes students of human social behavior confident that the possibilities of social adjustment and social achievement have not yet been fully explored. The patterns of action and life lodged in the minds of individuals by their group traditions become the standard by which the members of a human group measure and control their behavior. Hence individual behavior is of a high or low type, democratic or autocratic, militaristic or peaceful, according to the traditions of the group. The great traditions of law, government, religion, and morality have been gradually accumulated and refined by human groups. Science itself is an example of the nature and power of social tradition. All the knowledge of science, except the little which is being added at present, is tradition. Yet scientific knowledge is becoming increasingly the basis for wise social adjustments.

While human social behavior is increasingly based upon the knowledge, ideas, sentiments, and values which are embodied in the social traditions of groups, yet originally man must have started without definite social traditions. The first men, like the brutes, lived in a world of objects to which they reacted impulsively. They had not yet accumulated a body of knowledge with definite beliefs or standards; but as soon as the powers of abstract thought and articulate speech had developed, men could accumulate knowledge, store it up, and pass along their knowledge and beliefs from generation to generation. Thus culture and the effects of culture upon human relations became cumulative.

The simplest tool requires knowledge and skill in its making. When this knowledge is communicated from one individual to another, it becomes social property and is gradually increased by the contributions of different individuals and generations. Thus in human groups knowledge, sentiments, beliefs, values, are diffused throughout the group and perpetuated by processes of teaching and learning between generations. This process goes on with every phase of culture. Bit by bit human groups have acquired knowledge, skill, and values and transmitted them. In this way the social or group tradition became the fabric of the civilization or culture of the group. In this way man built himself up out of the world of mere objects with which he began into a world of ideas, sentiments, and values, the world of culture.

Superior individuals might add to the patterns which were followed in tool-making until the tool after thousands of years approached the perfection of modern physical tools. In the same way superior individuals might add to the patterns of government, law, religion, art, and morals. The social traditions in these various lines remain independent, yet interwoven. With the growth of these various traditions the world of natural objects grew of less and less importance in guiding human behavior, while the world of ideas, beliefs, sentiments, and values, which came to the individual through his oral and written language, became of greater importance in controlling human conduct; for as these social traditions grew in bulk their influence over human behavior increased. They came to control increasingly the adjustments of men, both to the objects of nature and to their fellow men. Institutional traditions and customs came increasingly to guide and control the behavior of the individuals in the group. Unity of group action became possible through the mutual adjustment of the behavior of the members of the group. This resulted in the integration of individual actions and individual feelings and purposes, so that the behavior of the group as a whole often became very highly uniform. In the greater groups of men, such as states and nations, a high degree of unity of purpose and action was frequently achieved through the like-mindedness created by their traditions,

and the discipline imposed by customs. While environmental conditions played a part in the formation of the greater human groups, yet the vital factor in their unity was undoubtedly of a subjective or spiritual nature; for it was the ideas, beliefs, sentiments, and values embodied in the traditions of these groups which made their unity and controlled their behavior. The understanding of any human group and of its behavior must accordingly come through the understanding of its traditions.

The Process of Social Development.—The process of social development is necessarily in part like that of organic evolution, in part like that of individual mental growth, since it is made up of both organically hereditary and individually acquired elements. However, if we neglect that part of social development which is brought about through the working of the factors in organic evolution (variation, heredity, and selection), then the social process presents itself as continuous adjustment and readjustment in the relations of individuals brought about by mental processes. The adjustments between individuals, as we have seen, necessarily must constantly change, not only on account of changing conditions in the environment but also because of the expansive character of life itself. Now, the adjustments, or coadaptations, between individuals which exist at any given time are the social order or organization of that particular time and place. Such coadaptations between individuals give rise to persistent forms of social activities, which we may term social habits, also called by some writers "folkways." As long as such persistent social activities, crystallized into institutions of law, government, religion, morality, and industry, work well, they usually receive but little attention. Accompanying these persistent activities, or social habits, are, of course, uniform ways of thinking and feeling in the group; and these habits of thought and feeling, as well as habits of action, are passed along by tradition or customary imitation from generation to generation.

Habits cannot exist in society any more than in the individual without continually being modified. Groups of individuals have con-

tinually to adjust themselves to new conditions in the environment, and so the relations between individuals themselves must also change. Hence, social habits must change. Now these changes in the adjustment of individuals to one another and of the group to its environment are brought about mainly by processes of mental interaction. That is, communication, suggestion, sympathy, imitation, and other forms of mental interaction bring about uniformity of ideas, feelings, and opinions within the group, both with reference to the old conditions and with reference to the new adjustment which must be made. Hence, we see at once the great function in the social life of such processes as public criticism, discussion, the formation of public opinion, the selection of leaders and programs for action. All these processes, and so also communication, suggestion, and imitation in general, manifestly have reference to building up new types of adjustment between the individuals of the group, or between the group and its environment.

Thus the development of our social life, so far as it is not brought about by the factors in organic evolution, is very like the process of mental growth or development in the individual. Just as in individual life there is a constant replacement of habits which are no longer workable, or are outgrown, so in our social life there is a continual replacement of old institutions and customs by new institutions and ways of living. So the process of social development is like the learning process in individuals. Just as in the individual superior adjustments can be made only by processes of attention, discrimination, the association of ideas, and judgments of value, so in the social group processes of communication, discussion, the formation of public opinion and of social values work to the same end. Moreover, as in the individual we find the highest consciousness in the transition from one habit to another, so in social life we also find the greatest use of mental interaction in the transition from one form of institution or association to another.

The student can readily illustrate all this from what has been said regarding the historical development of the fa[redacted], and also from the

social life of the present in which he lives, because all of our present social problems are due to the difficulties of effecting transition from one type of social adjustment to another. In the discussion of divorce, for example, it was especially pointed out that the present disintegration and confusion in our family life is due to the fact that the old type of family, which answered very well the needs of our forefathers, is no longer adapted to modern conditions, and that there is difficulty, in some classes of our population at least, in coming to an agreement regarding what shall be the new type of family. Social life thus develops largely through the continual interchange of opinions, ideas, and ideals as well as through the copying of activities and feelings by individuals.

It is impossible in this text to go in detail into the numerous factors which make up the process of social development. It may be pointed out, however, that imitation manifestly comes in wherever uniform, concerted action in the group is necessary or desirable. Imitation serves to diffuse uniform activities throughout a group. Hence, the imitative tendency in man is a very great factor indeed in the social life, because all social activity has in it this element of uniform, concerted action among individuals. Sympathy and understanding are two other closely related factors which have much to do with the social life. Sympathy brings about uniformity of feeling and therefore aids in securing uniformity of activity. Through sympathetic understanding individuals are able to co-ordinate their activities more harmoniously; thus successful social adjustment depends in very great measure upon sympathy and understanding between associates, and for this reason all social groups seek to cultivate sympathy and understanding among their members. Finally, conflict is also a method of social adjustment. However, conflict of the more serious sort is relatively an abnormal thing within the group, and arises only because the members of the group have failed to adjust themselves harmoniously to one another.

The Theory of Social Order.—Social order differs from social organization. Social organization may refer to any condition or relation

of the elements of a social group; but by social order is meant a settled and harmonious relation between the individuals or the parts of a society. The problem of social order is then the problem of harmonious adjustment among the individuals of the group; and the question arises, how do the relationships become settled and harmonious?

It is evident that all the factors which shape social organization must enter more or less into this problem of the determination of the conditions which make for settled and harmonious relationships among individuals. Social order, like social organization, therefore, will rest more or less upon the instincts and the acquired habits of the group. Harmonious relationships between individuals are furthered, of course, by certain native tendencies of individual human nature, such as the sexual and parental instincts, the gregarious "instinct," sympathy, and imitation. The acquired habits of social groups, also, whether we call them custom, tradition, usages, or folkways, make for settled and harmonious relationships between individuals. In animal groups and in the lowest human groups, social order is almost entirely an outcome of the working of instinct and habit. But in practically all human groups, except the very lowest, we find another factor working for social order, namely, regulative institutions. While a natural, spontaneous social order may be furnished by instinct, sympathy, custom, and tradition, the actual social order which we find in human groups is achieved rather by conscious means of social control over the individual.

The chief of these regulative institutions in human society are those which we group under the names of government, law, religion, morality, and education. Government and law are perhaps the oldest of the agencies consciously employed to secure social control over the individual. While government probably began, as we have seen, as a means of control in time of war, more and more government has extended its control over all other phases of social activity. Some totalitarian socialists would apparently make government absorb and direct all social activities. While such an extension of the functions

of government must be regarded as unsound in theory and unwarranted in practice, yet there can be no doubt that, inasmuch as the purpose of government is to regulate, its functions are "co-extensive with human interests."

Government and law, instead of being less needed in the future, will probably be more needed. The anarchistic ideal of no government is without any good scientific foundation. Nevertheless, government and law are, by themselves, relatively inadequate means of social control in very complex societies, because the control which they exert over the individual must necessarily be over gross external acts. Such social control does not go deep enough to secure a type of social order which is adequate for modern social life. Hence society needs, in order to achieve any high type of social order, not simply a well-developed governmental and legal system, but also highly developed systems of religion, morality, and education.

Religion, like government, is one of the oldest means of control in human societies. As we have already seen, the religious sanction when added to institutions gives them a stability and capacity to survive such as hardly anything else does. Personal religion prevents too wide a variation in the character and conduct of individuals. So we may agree with Lester F. Ward in declaring religion to be "the force of social gravitation which holds the social world in its orbit." When religious beliefs decay, the social order associated with them most frequently decays also. Hence the belief that society in the future may be able to do without religion is as unwarranted as the belief that society may be able to do without government. Instead of religion becoming less necessary as society advances, it becomes more necessary for the simple reason that there is more necessity for social control in complex societies. The church, instead of being an outworn institution in human society, therefore has before it a field of social usefulness in the present larger than in any past stage of social development. One of the greatest practical needs of modern society, from the standpoint of social order, is a religion adapted to the requirements of modern life.

Now, as has just been implied, religion secures its social effects chiefly by giving sanction to ethical standards and ideals. It ought not to be necessary, therefore, to argue the need of ethical standards and ideals as a means of social control in modern society. The moral, as we have seen, is the social raised to an ideal plane. Proper moral ideals in individuals and proper moral practices, or virtues, of themselves, would ultimately guarantee the harmonization of relationships between individuals, for the virtues are what mainly bind men together in harmonious relationships. As we have already seen, higher types of morality are needed as societies become more complex. The simple virtues that suffice for a rural population, living under simple conditions, are found to be no longer adequate for complex, urban populations. A stable and harmonious social order cannot exist in complex groups without high character in individuals. Now, this character depends largely upon the conscious moral ideals which the individual accepts. Hence, the great importance of moral ideals in society.

Of all the methods of social control, however, the education of the individual is the most effective. Human character is formed mainly in the plastic periods of childhood and adolescence. Now, education furnishes the ultimate and most subtle form of social control because it controls, as we have seen, the formation of habit and character in individuals. Moreover, education has this advantage over all other forms of social control, that it is best adapted to secure a *progressive* social order. Government, law, religion, and even moral ideals tend to become static, but education can as easily adapt itself to the higher social order which should be as to any social order which exists. An education which adapts the young to the social life before they participate in it, is therefore the wisest means of social control which human societies can devise.

It is evident that all these different regulative institutions must be developed to the highest possible efficiency in order to secure the type of social order which modern societies demand. One other factor, however, deeper even than these, must be emphasized, and

that is the factor of like-mindedness in individuals which Franklin H. Giddings made so much of in his sociological theories. Without such like-mindedness as is furnished by likeness of instinct, habits, feelings, desires, and interests in the population, social order would be impossible. But beyond this, social order demands a fundamental likeness in the beliefs, opinions, and values of individuals. Here comes in the whole problem of social assimilation. Now, present society is radically divided as to its ideals of life. Long ago Comte pointed out that no stability in our institutions could be assured as long as there was disagreement regarding the fundamental maxims of our social life. One of the greatest tasks of the social sciences, therefore, must be to bring men to more unanimity, more genuine unity, in their opinions regarding the meaning and ideals of life.

The Theory of Social Progress.—The nature and causes of progress have already been discussed in Chapter XVII on "Education and Social Progress." It is only necessary here to add a few words as to the relative importance of certain factors in progress, a topic which has been more or less considered throughout this book. Accepting the general idea that we may regard as progressive those changes in society which secure a more harmonious adjustment of individuals to one another and a better adaptation of social groups to the requirements of their existence, then we have the further question, What factors determine that changes will be progressive rather than retrogressive in their nature, and how may these factors be controlled? This, as we have seen, is the great practical problem to which sociology leads up, and it has received many different answers from the social thinkers of the past.

On the one hand there are thinkers who find the active factors in social progress exterior to the individual, and even some who find them to be entirely outside of society. According to the geographical determinists, the determining factors in human progress have been certain conditions of climate, food, and soil. This geographical theory received perhaps its fullest expression in the writings of Henry Thomas Buckle, who endeavored to show that the geographical con-

ditions in Europe alone were such as to favor the development and persistence of a high type of civilization. Later theorists of the same general school have held that the pressure of population upon food supply is what gives rise to invention, discovery, control over nature, and all the other phenomena of civilization. But progressive evolution certainly does not always take place in society when physical conditions are favorable, nor have the most favorable physical conditions prevented social retrogression in the past. We must rather regard geographical conditions, not as determining factors in progress, so much as opportunities or stimuli to social progress in certain directions.

Another set of thinkers have held that race, or biological conditions, is the determining factor in the progress of society. According to this theory, all the sources of social progress are given in the biological make-up of the individual. If individuals receive the right equipment by heredity, are of the right blood or breed, social progress will take care of itself. The more extreme eugenists sometimes make statements which resemble these; but as we have already seen, the control of physical heredity can solve only a small part of our social problems. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that race, any more than geographical conditions, is a very important active factor in progressive changes in human society. Race is important, not as an active factor in progress, but as a condition of progress. The potentialities of progress must, of course, be in the stock before they can be developed; but in human society so much comes, not by the way of physical heredity, but by the way of acquired habit and intelligent adaptation, that we must beware of laying too much stress upon the importance of the biological element. For example, our ancestors, three thousand years ago, were probably of better stock, physically, than we civilized men of to-day, yet they were also probably barbarians or savages. Social progress evidently comes more through the acquirements of individuals, passed on by social tradition, than from purely biological elements. The biological element at most furnishes merely the potentialities for social progress.

Economic determinism, or the economic theory of social progress, has already been discussed in Chapter XVI, in criticizing Marxian socialism; also throughout the book there has been emphasized the importance of economic factors as conditions and stimuli to progress. Of all the factors outside of the individual, economic factors are without doubt the most important, in modern social life, in furthering progressive or retrogressive changes. Nevertheless, from a scientific point of view, economic conditions must be regarded like geographical and biological conditions as simply furnishing a basis for social progress, rather than as the active element in progress. In other words, even the most perfect economic conditions would be but a preliminary step to make room for the higher mental and moral adjustments which constitute true social progress.

Philosophers and religious and moral teachers have for ages emphasized that the active agency in human progress is man's intellect, and that the character of human social life depends largely upon ideas and ideals. Much ridicule has been poured upon this so-called ideological theory of progress by the advocates of materialistic theories, such as geographical and economic determinism. But if intelligence is the supreme device to control individual and social adjustment, the ideological theory still deserves serious consideration even from the most rigorous scientific standpoint. Many of the advocates of this ideological theory have, however, laid it open to serious criticism by making thought, ideas, and ideals not so much instruments of social progress, as the social reality itself. Such ideological theorists have lost sight of the concrete life of societies, nations, and civilizations, and their theories deserve to be called one-sided. One can cordially recognize the importance of intellectual elements, ideas, and ideals in our social life without indorsing such a purely intellectualistic view of human society. The social life of animal groups is modified but little, if at all, by intellectual elements, but almost wholly by the influence of the physical environment; for this reason animal societies do not progress at all, or very slowly. This fact alone shows that the capacity for progress in human society rests upon man's higher in-

tellectual development, that is, upon ideas and ideals. However, it is the interaction of man's intellect with the physical and economic environment which produces progress, and not the abstract evolution of ideas.

In this and other books the author has repeatedly insisted that the ultimate reliance in social reconstruction must be the education of the young, and Lester F. Ward, in his *Dynamic Sociology*, has demonstrated once for all that education is the initial or proximate means of progress in human society. Yet education, if it is not of the right sort, can block all social progress, as we have already seen. Education itself must be controlled by certain ideas and ideals as to the meaning or purpose of our social life. Moreover, education is not so much a factor in progress as a method of progress. What, then, is the sociological theory of progress? The sociological theory of progress is synthetic. Sociology finds some truth in all the one-sided theories of progress, but it regards them when taken singly as partial and inadequate. This is not saying that all factors in social evolution, and in social progress, are of equal importance. Perhaps James Q. Dealey is correct in saying that race, economic organization, and education are the three vital things in social progress, given favorable natural resources; but it is certain that two of these, economic organization and education, must be guided and controlled by ideas and ideals, and could not become effective without the aid of government, law, and religion; all of which is again equivalent to saying that any scientific theory of social progress must be synthetic. Social policy must be broadened so as to give proper attention to all factors in the social life, and social reform movements must be not one-sided, but broad enough to give due recognition to each factor of importance, if any sort of satisfactory social adjustment is to be reached.

The Nature of Society.—Three great historical theories of the nature of society have been more or less held by the social thinkers of the past, and are, to some extent, still held by thinkers of the present. These theories are the contract, the organismic, and the cultural theories of society, to be briefly considered, as follows:

The contract theory of society is the view that the unity and organization of the social life are wholly a matter of agreement or understanding between individuals. According to this theory social organization is primarily an intellectual construction, depending upon expressed or implied agreement, explicit or implicit contract, between individuals. This theory would make the unity and organization of the family life, for example, to consist essentially in contract. Marriage and the family would be simply relations which rest upon the agreement of individuals; so, also, all the other institutions of society. The manifest weakness of this theory as a theory of social origins has led many of its recent advocates to modify it to this extent: They say that while society and its institutions may not have originated in contract, they should nevertheless now rest upon the basis of contract or agreement. Marriage and the family, for example, may not have originated in contract, but in the future these institutions should be based wholly upon contract or the mutual agreement of individuals. The inadequacy of this view has already been pointed out by showing the large part which biological elements and psychological elements other than the intellectual play in our social life. As we have seen, the foundations of society and of practically all institutions are far deeper than intellectual agreement. This has not only been true of the social past, but it will also hold true in the social future. Society is not merely an intellectual construction, for it is a phase of the life process, in which biological factors are fundamental.

The organismic theory of society is largely a reaction from the contract theory. It is the theory that society instead of being merely a product of intellectual agreement is wholly a product of the operation of the blind forces of organic nature; that it is a growth which has come about through the operation of biological laws. The unity of society is, therefore, according to the organismic theory, in no wise different from the unity which we find in the biological organism. Society, according to this view, is essentially an organic structure, subject to the general laws of organic growth and decay.

This pure biological theory of society, likening it to a biological

organism, has rarely been held exactly in the way just stated. Most of the writers that have adhered to the organismic theory have modified it in some way. Nevertheless, even such a writer as Herbert Spencer, who argues at length that society is an organism or a superorganism, represents society as a sort of superhuman organic structure, which we might presume to describe but hardly to control. The organismic theory is still further modified by other writers till it becomes little more than a means of emphasizing the unity and interdependence of the social life. When this is all that is meant by the organismic theory, there is little to criticize in it, except that it often suggests misleading analogies; for the resemblances between society and a biological organism, which the organismic theory assumes, are very far from being established. The organismic theory, however, in the history of sociological thought served to emphasize that human social life is a phase of organic life in general; that in it biological processes and forces are fundamental; that the unity of society is an expression of the original and continuing unity of the life process; and to this extent it performed an indispensable service.

However, the leading sociologists of the present accept the cultural theory of human society; that is, that the human societies which we know are largely creations of cultural development. But culture itself is a creation of the human mind. It consists, as we have seen, of mental patterns, or traditions, passed on from generation to generation, largely by learning from one another. These mental patterns, or traditions, become objectified in custom and institutions. Thus human societies present themselves as developing cultures.

If we overlook the biological part of human social development—heredity, variation, and selection—then, as we have seen, the human social process presents itself as a continuous adaptation and readaptation of human relations mediated and controlled by the culture of the group. Thus the cultural theory of human social behavior is not opposed to a broad psychological theory, if we remember that culture is cumulative, historical, and extra-individual. Consequently, when we look at human society from the standpoint of culture—that is,

from the standpoint of its folkways, its mores, its traditions, its customs, and its institutions—we must remember that all these have been learned by its individuals and are rooted in the nature and development of the human mind. Hence, the cultural theory gives a scientific basis for the hope that human intelligence may indefinitely modify and refine human social behavior through the development of culture. Moreover, when broadly enough conceived, the cultural theory of human relations synthesizes the elements of scientific value in the contract and organismic theories.

But if social policies and programs are to be consistently progressive, they must be controlled by a positive collective ideal as to the meaning or purpose of our social life. What, then, is its meaning? Not wholly within the individual life, for that is temporary; not in any minor group, for that is but a fragment of social life, a part of a larger whole. The meaning of our social life must rather be sought in the development of humanity as a whole. All the great and lasting movements of human history and of our own time have just this meaning—that they are strivings for the development of a humanity all of whose elements shall be harmoniously adjusted to one another, and to the requirements of existence. Accordingly, not the development of self or the dominance of any class or group, but the development of humanity, should become the real end of social endeavor. This end is alone truly synthetic and constructive, because it includes the development of the individual in accordance with the requirements of a progressive social life and the development of all classes, nations, and races who go to make up the whole of humanity. For the individual, the ideal of life becomes, according to this view, a life of service in which he shares in and strives to realize a higher life for all humanity.

SELECT REFERENCES

For brief reading:

BERNARD, L. L., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. I, XLI.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Man's Social Destiny*, Chap. II.

ELLWOOD, C. A., *The Psychology of Human Society*, Chaps. XV, XVI.
GILLIN, J. L., and GILLIN, J. P., *An Introduction to Sociology*, Chaps. XX-XXIII.
HART, H. N., *Technique of Social Progress*, Chaps. XIX-XXIV.

For more extended reading:

BERNARD, L. L., *Social Control.*
BOGARDUS, E. S., *Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, Rev. Ed.
BOGARDUS, E. S., *A History of Social Thought*, 2d Ed.
CASE, C. M., *Social Process and Human Progress.*
COOLEY, C. H., *Social Process.*
ELLWOOD, C. A., *A History of Social Philosophy.*
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Cultural Evolution.*
HAYES, E. C., *Recent Developments in the Social Sciences*, Chap. I.
HERTZLER, J. O., *Social Progress.*
HOBHOUSE, L. T., *Social Development.*
HOUSE, F. N., *The Development of Sociology.*
LICHTENBERGER, J. P., *Development of Social Theory.*
MACIVER, R. M., *Society: A Textbook of Sociology.*
MYERS, KING, TAYLOR, JENSEN, *Social Progress and Christian Ideals*, Part IV.
OGBURN, W. F., and NIMKOFF, M. F., *Sociology.*
PANUNZIO, C., *Major Social Institutions.*
ROSS, E. A., *Principles of Sociology.*
ROSS, E. A., *Social Control.*
SIMS, N. L., *The Problem of Social Change.*
SOROKIN, P. A., *Social and Cultural Dynamics.*
SOROKIN, P. A., *Contemporary Sociological Theories.*
TODD, A. J., *Theories of Social Progress.*
WALLAS, G., *The Great Society.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Questions:

1. How did animal society, or association, originate? Explain the parts played by (1) the control of food, (2) defense against enemies, and (3) reproduction.

2. Is human society natural or artificial, or both? Explain fully.

3. What has created the vast differences between human society and animal groups?

4. Explain fully the nature of human social behavior.

5. How far is the process of social development like the process of mental growth in the individual?

6. What is the relation of the individual and the group? Explain fully.

7. What is social order? What part do natural impulses and sympathies play in it? What part do regulative institutions, such as government, law, religion, morals, play? Discuss the social function of each of these.

8. Discuss education as an instrument of social order and as a means of securing social like-mindedness.

9. How does social progress differ from social evolution? What is the problem of social progress?

10. What conception of social progress has been worked out by sociology? What are the tests of social progress?

11. What part do geographical elements play in social progress? What are the limitations of their influence? Illustrate.

12. What part do biological or racial elements play in social progress? What are their limitations? Illustrate.

13. Why is the economic theory of social progress very popular today? What are its limitations? Illustrate.

14. What is meant by psychological theories of progress? Name and criticize different types of the psychological theories of progress.

15. If education is only a method of controlling the psychic factors in progress, why should we regard it as our ultimate reliance to secure normal progress?

16. What sort of education would be necessary to make education "the key to social progress"?

17. What great historical theories of the nature of society have been developed by social thinkers in the past? Why have not other theories been well developed?

18. What is "the contract theory" of society? Illustrate.

19. Why are human institutions not "arbitrary inventions"?

20. How much truth is there in the assertion that all human institutions and social relations are passing from a condition of "status" to a condition of "contract"? Illustrate.

21. Why does not the contract theory afford an adequate ideal of the social life? Illustrate.

22. What is the organismic theory of society? Trace the analogies between a society and an organism.

23. In what sense may society be regarded as an organism and in what ways do social groups differ in their life from organisms?

24. What useful purpose in the development of sociology did the organismic theory serve? What are some of its dangers?

25. What do we mean by a cultural or psychological theory of society? How does it synthesize the elements of value in other theories? Illustrate.

26. Wherein is the cultural conception of society distinctive, and what is its peculiar theoretical value? What is its practieal value? Illustrate.

27. Why is the idea of the production of "the superior individual" an inadequate goal for social life?

28. Is individual liberty an end or a means in the social life?

29. What must be our final definition of society?

30. What is the relation of the group to humanity?

31. Why is the production of a superior class or nation an inadequate goal for our social development?

32. Why is class, national, and racial egoism producing such disturbances in the present world? What is the remedy?

33. What ideal of the social life do we find alone to be adequate?

For classroom discussion:

1. Is social theory important for the development of the social sciences?

2. Seeing that we have no records, can we know much about the origin of human institutions?

3. Why is the process of social development in part like that of organic evolution, in part like that of individual mental growth?

4. Can order in human relations endure without government and law, moral codes, religion, and education?

5. If social improvement depends upon learning better ways of human living, what would be the scientific method of bringing about social progress?

Subject for debate or panel discussion:

Should sociology (as distinct from history, economics, and political science) be required in high school curricula?

GLOSSARY

(The student should consult the index for the location of definitions that are given in the text—such as those for *Groups, Social,. . . . Society,* and *Sociology.*)

Abnormal, not normal; *see* Normal.
Absolutism, a form of government which confers absolute or despotic authority upon an individual (or small group) over a large group.
Actinic, producing chemical changes.
Adaptation, the process by which individuals or groups modify their behavior to fit conditions.
Adjustment, the condition or state resulting from a process of adaptation.
Adventitious, accidental.
Aesthetic, pertaining to beauty; artistic.
Agnates, relatives on the father's side.
Albinos, individuals without pigment or coloring matter in skin, hair, or eyes.
Altruism, unselfish interest in others' welfare.
Amalgamation, the biological fusing (by mating) of two or more racial groups of people.
Anabolic, storing up energy, said of organic processes.
Analyze, or **Analyse,** to separate into parts and examine critically, said of study or reasoning.
Anatomical, pertaining to bodily structure.
Animism, the belief that everything, especially every living thing, has mind or soul.
Anthropoid, manlike.
Anthropology, the science which treats of man—his physical and mental character, environment, culture, etc.
Antisocial, opposed to social welfare.
Ascetic, given to strict self-denial; avoiding all comforts and pleasures, as for religious reasons.
Assimilation, the process by which groups or individuals of varying culture become alike by exchanging and fusing culture traits.
Association, comradeship.
Atavism, reversion to a more primitive type.
Attitudes, behavior tendencies to respond in a given manner to some situation or stimulus.
Autocracy, government by one person who holds supreme power in a state; despotism.
Autonomous, self-governing.
Bacteria, certain microorganisms, many of which are disease-producing.
Bacteriology, the science of bacterial life.

Barbarous, pertaining to barbarism, or the pre-literate stage before civilization.
Behavior pattern, a relatively uniform mode of action of individuals or groups.
Belief, the mental acceptance of a principle, proposition, or statement.
Biology, the science of life; the science of plants and animals.
Birth control, the practice of limiting the number of children born, especially by preventing impregnation.
Bolshevism, Russian communism; the doctrines or practices of the Russian Bolsheviki.
Botany, the science of plant life.
Caste, a social division of a community based on birth or occupation; a rigid, immobile class.
Catabolic, expending energy, said of organic processes.
Cataclysm, a violent, destructive change.
Category, a class of objects of knowledge or thought.
Ceremony, a set of acts, usually performed collectively, expressing belief in the importance and sanctity of an object or event; such as, for example, marriage.
Chemistry, the science of the composition of substances and of the atomic changes which they undergo.
Civilization, broadly, the culture of any human group; strictly, that stage of culture which began with the invention of writing and historical records.
Class, a horizontal division of society, composed of persons of similar rank, economically, politically, or the like.
Coadaptation, reciprocal adaptation.
Coadjustment, reciprocal adjustment.
Coercion, compulsion; the exercise of physical or political force.
Cognates, relatives on the mother's side.
Cognitive, pertaining to knowing or knowledge.
Collective behavior, actions carried on by a group in response to a situation; a group-behavior pattern.
Communication, the exchange of experiences, or ideas and feelings, usually by means of verbal language.
Community, any group of individuals carrying on the basic activities of life, usually in a limited territory and by means of mental interactions.
Competition, the struggle between two or more individuals or groups, usually impersonal, to attain some end.
Conflict, the direct, usually hostile, struggle between individuals or groups which aims at the elimination or destruction of the rival.
Conscious, aware.
Co-operation, working together to attain a common end.
Cosmic, pertaining to the universe.
Criminology, the science which studies the problem of crime.
Criteria, marks by which a thing is judged.
Culture, anything acquired by learning; civilization in the broadest sense.
Culture complex, a group of interrelated culture traits.

Culture pattern, a combination of culture traits, often characterizing a culture as a whole.
Culture trait, a basic unit or element in culture, such as a tool or a religious belief.
Custom, a social habit approved by a group.
Deduction, reasoning from principles to facts.
Delinquents, those guilty of violating custom or law.
Determinism, the doctrine that there is no free-will or freedom of choice.
Disintegration, social group disorganization, or dissolution.
Dynamics, the science of change.
Economics, the science of the production and distribution of wealth.
Encyclopedic, containing all knowledge.
Environment, outside surroundings, whether physical or social.
Ethics, the science of right and wrong conduct.
Ethnology, the science of race.
Eugenics, the science of improving human heredity.
Evaluate, to estimate, or to value.
Exploitation, the selfish use of a person or a class by another person or class.
Factor, any element which originates, affects, or influences a given process.
Felony, a serious crime; a major offense.
Folkways, the habits of a group of people.
Function, the way in which a factor or process works.
Genesis, origin.
Genetic, pertaining to origin or heredity.
Genetics, the science of heredity.
Geology, the science of the structure and development of the earth.
Geometric ratio, a ratio which proceeds by multiplication.
Group behavior, *see* Collective behavior.
Habits, learned modes of behavior.
Hedonism, the doctrine that pleasure is the chief good.
Hereditary, transmitted through the germ cells from parent to offspring.
Heterogeneous, of different sorts or kinds.
Homicide, the killing of a human being; murder.
Homology, a structural similarity.
Human nature, (1) the qualities, characteristics, and tendencies generally found in man; or (2) the original, innate nature of man.
Hybrid, a cross between two varieties or species.
Hygiene, the science of health.
Ideological, explaining entirely in terms of ideas.
Idiot, a feeble-minded person with the intelligence of a child under two years.
Imbecile, a feeble-minded person with the intelligence of a child under seven years.
Imitation, the process by which individuals or groups copy modes of behavior of other individuals or groups.

Increment, increase.
Individualism, the doctrine that individuals or the values of individuals alone exist.
Induction, reasoning from facts to principles.
Instincts, native impulses which characterize a race or species.
Institutions, ways of living established by legal authority.
Integrated, unified.
Integration, social, the co-ordination of the activities of the members of a social group, so as to bring about group unity.
Intellectualistic, explaining entirely in terms of the intellect, or intelligence.
Intelligence, problem-solving ability.
Interaction, the process of reciprocal stimulation and response between individuals or groups.
Intercommunication, reciprocal communication.
Invention, the creation of a new idea, behavior, pattern, tool, or trait.
Involuntary, not consciously chosen or willed.
Isolation, the condition in which individuals or groups have little contact or communication with one another.
Jurisprudence, the science of law.
Laissez-faire, let alone; the opposite of social or collective control.
Leadership, the ability to guide or influence others.
Learning, the process by which purposive changes take place in the behavior of individuals or groups.
Maladjustment, social, the process or condition by which individuals or groups come to function inadequately in a given social situation.
Matriarchal, pertaining to the rule or government of mothers.
Mental, pertaining to the mind.
Metabolism, the process of chemical changes in the body.
Metaphysical, beyond external nature; beyond experience.
Metronymic, taking the name of the mother.
Misdemeanor, a minor offense.
Morals, the standards for social behavior accepted by a group.
Mores, customs, especially those held to be very important socially.
Mulatto, a cross between the Negro and the white; a mixed-blood.
Mutation, a great or sudden variation, transmissible by heredity.
Norm, standard; rule; ideal.
Normal, according to standard; conducive to survival and development.
Normative, setting standards or ideals.
Nurture, environmental influences, as contrasted with nature or heredity.
Objective, outside the individual; in external nature.
Optimism, the view that the good will prevail, or can be made to prevail.
Penology, the science of punishing or reforming the criminal.
Personality, the sum of the mental and social qualities of a human individual.
Pessimism, the view that evil will prevail.

Phenomenon, (*plural,* **phenomena**) an occurrence; anything which happens.
Philology, the science of language.
Philosophy, the science which deals with ultimate problems, especially with the presuppositions of the concrete sciences.
Politics, the science and art of government.
Prejudice, an attitude toward any object, person, or group formed without adequate knowledge or without regard to facts.
Primary group, a group of people characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation.
Primitive, very early; at the beginning.
Proletariat, the class of manual workers or laborers.
Promiscuity, the mating of the sexes without any social sanction or control.
Protozoa, the earliest animal forms.
Psychic, mental.
Psychology, the science of mental life.
Race, a biological variety, or breed, usually of human beings. (*see* Chapter XI.)
Race mixture, the biological intermixture through interbreeding of relatively distinct racial stocks.
Rationality, the higher intelligence which characterizes man.
Reason, the same as rationality, or reasoning.
Recidivism, the habit of relapsing into crime.
Revolution, the change from one ruling class, or established social order, to another, usually sudden, violent, and bloody.
Secondary group, a group of people without intimate, face-to-face relations, held together by some common purpose, interest, or characteristic.
Selection, natural, the elimination of unadjusted types, either through death or through failure to reproduce.
Sensate, dominated by sense impressions and sense satisfactions.
Social adaptation, *see* Adaptation.
Social adjustment, *see* Adjustment.
Social class, *see* Class.
Social control, the process by which a social group guides or forces its members to accept some approved mode of social behavior.
Social environment, the environment of individuals or groups in social relations, whether material or immaterial.
Social evolution, the development of social groups, usually of human social organization, customs, and institutions.
Social heritage, the same as culture; a phrase used to distinguish culture from biological heredity.
Social interaction, *see* Interaction.
Social order, the entire complex of social relations and institutions in given society.
Social organization, any relating of individuals or groups to one another in a definite way.

Social problem, a problem in human relations, usually a problem resulting from maladjustment.

Social process, the process of interaction between individuals or groups.

Social progress, improvement in the material or spiritual conditions of human life; advancement by a social group toward some desirable end. (*See* Chapter XVIII.)

Social tradition, *see* Tradition.

Social unity, the coadaptation or coadjustment of the activities of the individuals in a group, so as to bring about unity of aim; to be distinguished from social uniformity.

Social values, objects, acts, beliefs, or modes of action which any social group regards highly or uses to guide the thought, aims, or activity of its members.

Social work, professional treatment, usually philanthropic, of individuals or families, to prevent or remedy their social maladjustments.

Socialization, the process of integrating oneself in a social group.

Socialize, to incorporate or integrate with society; to make socially-minded.

Species, a group of closely related animals or plants characterized by similar structure.

Statics, a science which considers things as not changing.

Statistics, the collection, enumeration, and comparison of social facts in order to measure social tendencies.

Status, a fixed rating or rank of a person or group with reference to other individuals or groups.

Stigmata, marks or signs.

Stimulus, anything which excites action.

Struggle, the contest of individuals or groups to satisfy some need or attain some end. *See* Competition and Conflict.

Subjective, within the individual, especially within the mind of the individual.

Symbol, an easily recognizable object or act which represents something other than itself, such as a flag or the words of a language.

Syndicalism, an extreme form of socialism based upon occupational groups.

Synthesis, the process of putting together in a logical whole.

Technology, the applications of physical science, especially in tools and machines.

Totalitarianism, an extreme form of absolutism, in which the government claims complete authority over all phases of social life.

Toxins, poisons.

Tradition, knowledge, beliefs, or sentiments passed along from generation to generation.

Trend, the more or less persistent movement of social phenomena in a given direction.

Unicellular, one-celled.

Unilateral, one-sided.

Urbanization, the development of city life.

Usages, social habits which have no social compulsion attached to them.

INDEX

Abbott, Edith, 215
Abnormal classes, 15, 283–287, 315
Accidents, industrial, 179, 290
Acquired traits, 30–31, 33–35, 57–59, 70, 297, 329, 360
Active factors in association, 69, 386
Adaptation, biological, 27, 29, 53
Adaptation, social, 45, 55, 64, 72, 364–366, 379
Adjustment, social, 4, 16, 17, 20, 66, 81; *see* Reconstruction, social
Adler, Felix, 87, 161
Agriculture, 41, 42, 109, 265–280
  history of, 41, 265–268
  in the Southern states, 267, 270–272
Altruism, 38–39, 60, 82, 116, 160, 362
Americanization, 209–212, 236
Ancestor worship, 109, 123–128, 130
Andaman islanders, 97
Anderson, H. W., 338
Anderson, N., 263
Andrews, B. R., 87
Angell, J. R., 53
Animal family life, 92, 94–96
Animal societies, 3, 29–30, 39–40, 375
Anthropology, 19, 40, 41, 50, 96
Apes, family life of, 94, 95
Aristotle, 12, 93
Aronovici, C., 88
Asceticism, 132
Association 5, 7, 30, 39, 75, 130, 374–375
  forms of 5, 12, 75–77, 104, 118
Atavism, 327
Australian aborigines, 97
Authority, 13, 69, 81, 134, 150, 365

Baber, R. E., 161
Bachofen, J. J., 96, 104, 105, 106
Bagehot, W., 194
Bagley, W. C., 372
Ballard, L. V., 88, 102, 161
Barnes, H. E., 341
Bear, R. M., 372
Behavior, social, 6, 20, 55–64, 65, 377
Beliefs, 78, 80
Bernard, J., 161
Bernard, L. L., 21, 49, 72, 391, 392
Bernstein, E., 357
Betts, G. H., 372
Biological conditions of social life, 9, 25, 31–39, 47, 49, 52, 69, 90, 100, 170, 188, 348, 374–379, 386
Biological point of view in sociology, 39, 49
Biology, 9, 24, 25, 29, 31–39, 52, 54, 69, 79, 90, 100, 218, 386
Birth rate, decrease of, 168–177, 182–184, 186, 187
  causes of decrease in, 172–177
  in cities, 254, 275
Bogardus, E. S., 21, 72, 73, 215, 392
Boies, H. M., 341
Bolshevism, 16, 345, 352
Booth, Charles, 284
Bossard, J. H. S., 311
Bratt System, 335
Brawley, B., 241
Briffault, R., 97, 102, 120
Brooks, J. G., 358
Buckle, H. T., 218, 385
Burgess, E. W., 21, 72, 263
Burt, C. L., 341
Bushee, F. A., 88, 161, 189, 215

Calhoun, A. W., 161
Capital, 345
Carpenter, N., 263
Carr-Saunders, A. M., 189
Case, C. M., 392
Character, individual, 7, 36, 58, 65, 98
Charitable institutions, 303–305
Charity, 293, 300–305
Charity Organization Societies, 301–303
Child, influence of the, 80, 92, 93, 100, 116, 159
Child labor, 85, 86, 160
Child welfare, 80–82, 86, 92, 115, 152, 159, 181
Childlessness, 80, 152, 174
Chinese immigration, 213
Christianity, influence on family, 131–132, 158
  evolution of, 78, 351
Church, Christian, 131, 158
Cities, growth of, 128, 146, 244–253
  causes of growth in, 249–253
  minor causes of, 252–253

Citizenship, education for, 16–19, 81, 157, 360–372
City, the problem of the, 244–263
City life, social conditions of, 253–258, 323
  the reconstruction of, 258–261
Civilization, 5–7, 16, 30, 40–42, 45, 58, 62, 66, 78, 81, 82, 101, 115, 116, 134–136
  modern, 134–136
Classes, social evolution of, 44
Climate and season, influence of, 70, 110, 179, 304, 321, 385
Clow, F. R., 372
Coadaptation, social, 30, 72, 379
Commerce, 251
Committee of Fifty, 294, 329, 342
Communication, 6, 30, 64–65, 68, 72, 78, 378, 380
Communism, 276, 344–357
Communities, 5, 75, 77
Competition, 37, 45–47
Comte, Auguste, 8, 9, 385
Conflict, 36, 40, 42–44, 46, 350
Congestion of population in cities, 261
Conklin, E. G., 49, 50
Conn, H. W., 49
Consciousness, social role of, 4, 52, 53, 55, 61, 63, 379, 391
Contract theory of society, 25, 127, 145, 389
Control, social, 13, 68, 344, 349, 356, 364
Cooley, C. H., 72, 73, 78, 87, 368, 392
Coolidge, Mrs. Mary Roberts, 216
Co-operation, 30, 38, 46, 82, 184
Counterfeiting, 340
Counts, G. S., 372
Crime, 314–341
  among foreign-born, 201, 202, 323
  among Negroes, 225, 229, 323
  definition of, 314
  statistics of, 314–320
  extent of, in United States, 316–320
  cost of, in United States, 318, 319
  increase of, 319
  causes of, 321–328
  Lombroso's theory of, 327
  influence of physical degeneracy on, 328
  influence of heredity on, 328
  remedies for, 331–334
  prevention of, 336–340
Criminals, classification of, 315–316
Criminology, 314
Cultural evolution, 30, 31, 49, 62, 66, 70, 78, 194, 376–380, 390
Cultural groups, 5, 31, 65–67, 97, 194, 377
Culture, defined, 6, 30, 65, 71
Curriculum in education, 367–400
Custom, 58, 65, 78, 91, 194, 378–380

Darwin, 24, 25, 27, 93, 184, 346
Darwin's theory of descent, 24–28
Davidson, Thomas, 365
Davie, M. R., 215
Dawson, C. A., 88
Dealey, J. Q., 388
Death rate, decrease of, 168, 170, 177–180
  causes influencing, 177–182
  of Negroes in United States, 230, 231
  in cities, 255
De Coulanges, Fustel, 123, 132
Defects, individual, 286, 290, 296–300, 304, 326
Degeneracy, in cities, 255–257
  and pauperism, 297
  and crime, 328
Delinquent children, 317, 335
Democracy, 17, 43, 78, 144, 165, 206, 208, 369, 351, 355, 368, 377
  education for, 17, 368
Dependency, *see* Poverty
Dependent children, 304
Depressed classes, genesis of, 285–288
Depressions, industrial, 291
Desertion, family, 136, 295
Devine, E. T., 311, 355
De Vries, Hugo, 28
Dewey, J., 372
Dexter, R. C., 311
Dickerson, R. E., 72
Discussion, public, 160, 352
Disease, 175, 183, 227, 255, 274, 293, 328
Divorce, 125, 127, 129, 131, 136–156
  statistics of, 139–142
  distribution of, in United States, 140
  grounds for granting, 141–142
  causes of increase in, 144–149
  remedies for, 151–159
Domestic arts, 15, 83, 158
Douglas, P. H., 161, 311
Dow, G. S., 21
Dowd, Jerome, 271
Du Bois, W. E. B., 271
Dugdale, R., 294, 297, 328

East, E. M., 189
Economic conditions, 11, 12, 32, 37, 40, 42, 44, 71, 80, 83–87, 98, 109, 111, 112, 114, 118, 119, 128, 129–131, 134, 135, 146, 152, 159, 168–174, 177–186, 188, 192, 195, 196, 199–205, 208, 211, 214, 232, 245, 249–252, 257, 265–280, 283–310, 322, 323, 344–356, 370, 387

Economic determinism, 118, 130, 188, 345–354, 387
Economic planning, 308–310
Economics, 11, 12, 83
Education, and social progress, 14, 360–372, 388
  relations of sociology to science of, 14
  as a means of social reconstruction, 16–18, 157, 159, 212, 238, 240, 331, 355, 360–372, 384, 390
  of women, 85, 146, 157, 175
  of the Negro, 233–241
  social function of, 363, 364
  as a factor in social evolution, 364, 371
  socialized, 366–371
  vocational, 370
Educational conditions of cities, 257
Educational system, defects in, 292, 324, 366
Efficiency, social, 38, 46, 48, 368
Eighteenth Amendment, *see* Prohibition law
Elberfeldt System, 301
Elimination of unfit, 27, 36, 44, 47, 296, 299, 326
Eliot, T. D., 88
Ellwood, C. A., 9, 13, 15, 16, 21, 49, 50, 72, 87, 102, 161, 188, 311, 357, 372, 391, 392
Elmer, M. C., 88, 161
Ely, R. T., 358
Embree, E. R., 229, 241
Emerson, H., 342
Emotions, 59, 60, 63, 69, 70
Engels, 346
England, birth rate of, 169, 170
  crime in, 318, 320
Epileptic, the chronic, 298
Ethics, 13, 48, 150, 160, 369
Eugenics, 187, 239
Evolution, definition of, 7
  current meanings of, 24, 28
  bearing of, upon social problems, 24–49
  Spencer's theory of, 28
  phases of universal, 29–31
  cosmic, 29
  organic, 29–40
    factors in, 31–39
  mental, 29
  cultural, 30, 58, 61, 68, 72, 78, 365, 377
Evolution, social, 8, 16, 37, 38, 39, 49, 53, 55, 62, 68, 374–381
  factors in, 31–39, 64, 65, 69, 70
  survey of, 39–48

Fairchild, H. P., 215
Family, the, 5, 38, 75–161
  the primary social institution, 76, 79, 82
  functions of, in social organization, 79–82
  function in conserving the social order, 80, 84
  function of, in social progress, 81–83
  and industry, 83–86, 118, 146
  as a school for socializing the individual, 84
  the normal family, 86, 159–161
  origin of, 90, 101
  biological foundations of, 90–95
  origin of, in human species, 93–99
  the earliest form of, in human species, 100
  the forms of, 104–119
  historical development of, 122–132
  influence of Christianity upon, 131–132, 158
  instability of modern, 137–161
  reconstruction of, 151–159
  decrease in size of, 171–177
Family life, 75–161
  differences between that of man and of the brutes, 94–96
  of the lower human races, 96–100
  Roman, 122–132
  decay of modern, 134–161
    as affecting crime, 151, 321
Farm land, 273, 277
Farm tenancy, 271, 277
Farming, *see* Agriculture isolated, 267
Fay, E. A., 298
Feeble-minded, the, 298, 299, 303, 315
Feeling, 59–61
Feminism, 145
Ferri, E., 341
Findlay, J. J., 88
Finney, R. L., 372
Fisher, I., 342
Fiske, John, 50
Flexner, B., 341
Folsom, J. K., 161
Food process, 39, 119, 274
Force, limits of, 352
Ford, J., 311, 341
Fosdick, R. B., 341
France, birth rate, 169, 170
Frazer, J. G., 102
Freedom and social evolution, 17, 48, 355
Freedom of speech, 17, 160, 372
Freelove, 101

Galpin, C. J., 280
Geddes, P., 102, 263
Geographic influences, 70, 71, 110, 221, 251, 289, 321

George, Henry, 286
Gettys, W. C., 88
Giddings, F. H., 385
Gillette, J. M., 88, 263, 281, 311, 341
Gillin, J. L., 21, 102, 161, 311, 341, 392
Gillin, J. P., 21, 161, 341, 392
Gilman, Mrs. C. P., 145
Gist, N. P., 261, 263
Glueck, S. S., 341
Goddard, H. H., 311, 328
Good, A., 372
Goodsell, Miss W., 102, 120, 132, 161
Government, 6, 12, 43, 69, 80, 382
  defects in, 292, 324
  nature of, 353, 382
Greek family, 122, 129
Gregory, E. W., 21
Groups, primary, 5, 20, 75–76, 77–79
Groups, social, 3–5, 7, 20, 30, 38, 40, 44, 65–69, 75–87, 374–379
Groves, E. R., 21, 73, 88, 102, 161, 162, 372
Gulick, S., 216
Gummere, F. B., 133
Guyot, Y., 358

Habits, acquired, 31, 57–59, 78, 130, 150, 157, 360, 382
  social, 58, 107
Halbert, L. A., 261, 263
Harper, E. B., 311
Hart, H. N., 73, 102, 162, 241, 372
Hayes, E. C., 392
Haynes, F. E., 341
Healy, W., 319, 342
Hearn, W. E., 132
Hebrews, 112, 122, 132
Hegel, G. W. F., 130
Henderson, C. R., 311
Heredity, 33–35, 80, 297–298, 315, 328–329, 360
  racial, 218–221, 297–298, 315, 328
    of the Negro, 221
  and pauperism, 297
  and crime, 328
Hiller, E. T., 21
History and sociology, 10
Hobhouse, L. T., 392
Hocking, W. E., 73
Hoffman, F. L., 230
Homicide in United States, 317
Hoover, C. B., 358
Hourwich, I. A., 215
House, F. N., 392
Howard, G. E., 120, 132, 162
Human nature, 52–72, 101, 296
Huxley, T. H., 38

Ideals, sources of, 62, 77, 78, 82
  importance of, 82, 157, 369
Illegitimacy, 156, 227, 229
Illiteracy, of immigrants, 201, 208
  of Negroes, 233
  and crime, 324
Imagination, 61, 68
Imitation, 57, 65, 130, 194, 325, 381
Immigration, problem of, 191–215
  history of, into United States, 195–202
  changed character of, 197
  distribution of, 197–199
  social effects of, 200–202
  into other countries, 202–204
  restrictions on, 204–207
  measures for Americanization, 209–212
  Asiatic, 213–215
Imprisonment, substitutes for, 335
Impulses, native, 55–57, 70
Indians, North American, 96, 105, 107–109
Individual, the, 7, 14, 35, 40, 63, 77, 135, 184, 291, 296
Individualism, 40, 134, 137, 144, 366
Industrial conditions, among the Negroes, 232
  and poverty, 289–292
  and crime, 322
Industrialism, 134, 137, 146, 245, 248
Industry, 11, 37, 45, 83, 118, 134, 146
  and the family, 83–86, 118, 134, 146
  pastoral, 109
  centralization of, 250
  See also Economic conditions
Infant mortality, 181
Insane, the, 299, 303, 315, 327
Instincts, human, 55–57, 70, 93, 100, 101, 219
Institution, definition of, 58, 76
Institutions, bases of human, 58, 69, 76, 82, 100, 149
Insurance, social, 305–308
Intelligence, 29, 55, 61–64, 369, 377, 387
Intemperance, and poverty, 293–294
  and crime, 329–331
Interaction, mental, 4, 5, 9, 30, 52, 64, 375, 380
Intercommunication, 6, 30, 64, 65, 68, 380
Interlearning, 68, 378
Invention, 12, 62, 65

Japanese immigration, 213–214
Jenks, J. W., 215
Jennings, H. S., 49
Jensen, H. E., 392
Johnson, C. S., 241, 281

Johnston, H., 241
Jukes family, 294, 297, 328
Juvenile court, 159, 336

Kallikak family, 328
Kellogg, V., 49
Kelso, R. W., 311
Key, Miss Ellen, 145
Kilpatrick, W. H., 373
Kinneman, J. A., 373
Kirkup, T., 358
Klineberg, O., 73, 241
Kroeber, A. L., 49
Kunkel, F., 72

Labor, 83–86, 305–309; *see* Unemployment and Wages
  of children, 85, 160, 290
  of women, 85, 159
Lacassagne, 326
Laidler, H. W., 358
Lane, M. D., 311
Language, 6, 30, 31, 44, 62, 66, 68, 78, 80
Law, relations to sociology, 13
  criminal, 316, 324
  nature of, 382–383
Laws, social, 10, 188
Leadership, social, 151, 158, 160, 369, 380
Learning, 67, 68, 363
Lecky, W. E. H., 133
Lichtenberger, J. P., 161, 392
Lindeman, E. C., 263
Liquor problem, 336–340
Literacy test, 208
Locke, A. L., 241
Lombroso, 327
Lorimer and Osborn, 189
Love, sexual and parental, 57, 81, 82, 93, 101, 375
Lowie, R. H., 102, 120
Lumley, F. E., 21
Lynd, R. S., 88

McCurdy, J. F., 133
McDonald, J. R., 358
McDougall, W., 50, 73
MacIver, R. M., 21, 392
Maladjustment, social, 8, 15, 288, 315
Malinowski, B., 97, 102
Malthus, T. R., 32, 182, 187
  theory of population, 181–187
Man, fossil remains of, 27
Mangold, G. B., 312
Mann, P. M., 312
Marett, R. R., 50
Margold, C. W., 102
Marriage, 94, 97, 110, 112, 115, 119, 125, 127, 131, 137, 138, 153, 155, 156, 157
  ceremony, 94, 125
  forms of, 110–118
Marx, Karl, 130, 285, 345–354
Marxian socialism, theoretical basis of, 345–353
  criticism of, 345–353
Mass as a social factor, 164–165
Materialistic conception of history, 346
Maternal family, 104–108
Matriarchy, 104–106
Mayo-Smith, R., 216
Mecklin, J. M., 241
Mendelian inheritance, 34, 35, 299
Migration, causes of, 191, 192
  as factor in social evolution, 192–195
Miller, K., 241
Millis, H. A., 216
Mind, function of, 52–72
  social character of, 63–65
Mohammedan peoples, 112
Monogamy, 93, 95, 96, 97, 100, 110, 115–118, 136
Morality, 13, 44, 47, 62, 78, 80, 369, 384
Mores, the, 58, 157, 160, 263
Morgan, L. H., 96, 102, 104, 106
Mormons of Utah, 112
Morrison, W. D., 341
Motion pictures and crime, 324
Mowrer, E. R., 162
Mumford, L., 263
Municipal socialism, 260–261
Muntz, E. E., 263
Mutation, 28, 35

National origins system, 209
Native impulses, 55–59
Nature of society, 4, 5, 7, 25, 377, 388
Nature peoples, 97
Negritos, of Philippine Islands, 97
Negro, racial heredity, 219–222
  influence of slavery on, 222
  statistics of, in United States, 223–226, 230–232
  increase of, 224–225, 231
  social condition of, 226–234
  industrial condition of, 232–233
  educational progress, 233–234, 238–239
  political condition of, 234
  proposed solutions of problem, 235–240
Neo-Malthusianism, 187
Newman, Dr. G., 181
Nimkoff, M. F., 50, 73, 162, 215

Non-Marxian socialism, 353–354
North, C. C., 312

Odum, H. W., 21, 241, 312
Ogburn, W. F., 50, 73, 162, 215
Oldham, J. H., 252
Order, social, 58, 381–385
Organic theory of society, 389
Organization, social, 7, 8, 43, 58, 69, 101, 360, 375, 382
Origin of the family, 90–101
  of government, 43
  of races, 221
  of society, 39, 374–377
Osborn, H. F., 50
Outdoor relief, 300

Palmer, V., 88
Panunzio, C., 392
Parental care, 92–93, 101, 116
Parental instinct, 92
Park, R. E., 21, 72, 216, 263
Parmelee, M. F., 312, 341
Parsons, Mrs. E. C., 102
Parsons, P. A., 21, 341
Pastoral industry, 109
Paternal family, 108–110
Patriarchal family, 108–110, 123–126, 128, 132
Pauperism, definition of, 283
  and degeneracy, 297
  remedies for, 298–305
Payne, E. G., 373
Penology, 314
Personality, 7, 36, 145
Peters, C. C., 373
Phelps, H. A., 312
Philanthropy, scientific, 15, 298–305
Philosophy of history, 11
Philosophy of socialism, 345
Plantation, origin of, 267
Political science, 12
Polyandry, 110–111
Polygamy, 112
Polygyny, 112–115
Population, growth of, 164–188
  control of, 185–187
  distribution of, 246–249
  farm, 247, 269
Poverty, definition of, 283
  among foreign-born, 202
  and pauperism, 283–284
  extent of, in United States, 284–285
  causes of, 285–298
  remedies for, 298–311
Press, as an educational agency, 160, 209, 324
  influence of, on crime, 324
Primary groups, 5, 20, 75–76, 77–79
Prison statistics, 317–320
Prison system, 333–334
Probation, 335
Progress, social, 9, 35, 81, 82, 360–372, 385–388
Prohibition law, 329–331, 336–340
Promiscuity, theory of primitive, 97–100
  objections to theory of, 98–100
Property, private, 76, 80, 345
Psychology, relation of sociology to, 9
  bearing upon social problems, 52–72
  theory of human society, 347, 390–391
Public charity, 300–305
Public discussion 160, 351, 352, 380
Public opinion, 157, 161, 208, 209, 351, 352, 380
Punishment, 333

Queen, S. A., 263, 311, 312
Quetelet, 322

Race as a factor in social evolution, 218–220
Races, intermixture of, 226–228
Racial heredity, 218–220
Racketeering, 318, 323, 331
Raper, 242
Rationality, 61–63
Reckless and Smith, 341
Reconstruction, social, 16–19, 57, 87, 100, 151, 157, 160, 161, 187, 207, 235, 258, 275, 352, 354, 356, 366, 371
  of the family, 151–159
  of population policy, 185–187
  of immigration policy, 207–209
  of Negro policy, 235–240
  of our city life, 258–261
  of rural life, 275–279
  of education, 366–371
Red Cross Society, 302–303
Reformation of criminals, 332–334, 361
Reinhardt, J. M., 88, 263, 311, 341
Religion, 6, 109, 114, 117, 125, 130, 157, 258, 355
Religious conditions of cities, 258
Reproduction, 31–33, 38, 39, 79, 92, 101, 165, 187, 374
Reuter, E. B., 162, 188, 215, 241
Revolution as means of social reconstruction, 345, 350–352, 354, 356
Richmond, Miss Mary E., 312
Robbins, C. L., 373
Roman family, 122–132

Romans, 122
Ross, E. A., 21, 73, 216, 392
Roucek, J. S., 373
Rowntree, B. S., 284, 342
Rural civilization, 278
Rural communities, 265–268
Rural problems, 265–280
Rural programs, 275–279
Russia, 138, 166, 276, 309, 345, 352

Sait, Una B., 162
Sanderson, D., 281
Schaeffer, H., 133
Schmiedeler, E., 133, 162
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 115
Schrieke, B., 216
Science, purpose of, 16, 350
Scudder, Miss V., 358
Segregation of unfit, 298, 299
Selection, artificial, 27, 47, 207, 386, 387
  natural, 27, 29, 30, 47, 48, 231, 287, 288
Sensate culture, 149, 349
Sex, 90, 91, 326
Sexes, differences between, 90, 91, 326
  numerical equality of, 92, 113, 116, 119, 200, 253
Share croppers, 268
Shaw, C., 341
Sherwell, Rowntree and, 342
Sims, N. L., 380, 392
Slavery, 45, 109, 112, 113, 222
Small, A. W., 71
Smith, T. L., 280
Smith, W. C., 215
Smith, W. R., 88, 373
Snedden, D., 88, 373
Social, meaning of term, 5
Social causes, 108, 118–119, 129, 131, 177, 296, 325, 347
Social change, 9, 104, 129, 131, 135, 379
Social development, process of, 379–381
Social dynamics, 9
Social evolution, *see* Evolution
Social instincts, *see* Instincts, human
Social insurance, 305–308
Social order, 58, 381–385
Social organization, *see* Organization, social
Social patterns, 78, 82, 87, 378
Social phenomena, defined, 5
Social problem, defined, 87, 152, 348, 352
Social progress, *see* Progress, social
Social reconstruction, *see* Reconstruction, social
Social research, 356
Social retrogression, 9, 83, 127, 177, 364, 386
Social science, 10, 13, 18, 368–369
Social Security Act, 305–308
Social service, 81, 82, 287–288, 369, 371
Social statics, 8
Social surveys, 88
Social values, 13, 31, 65, 76, 78, 82, 100, 269, 362, 377
Social work, 15, 355
Socialism, relation to sociology, 16, 17
  in the light of sociology, 344–357
    theoretical basis of, 345
    criticisms of Marxian, 347–353
    substitute for, 354–356
Socialization, 77, 81, 206, 366
  of education, 366–371
Society, definition of, 3–5
  the study of, 3–21
  products or phases of, 5–7
  origin of, 39, 374–377
  nature of, 388–391
Sociology, definition of, 7–8
  faulty conception, 8
  problems of, 8, 9
  statical, 8
  dynamical, 9
  relations to other sciences, 9–15
    to biology, 9
    to psychology, 9
    to history, 10
    to economics, 11
    to politics, 12
    to law, 13
    to ethics, 13
    to education, 14
    to social work, 15
    to social reconstruction, 16–19
    to socialism, 16–17
  and social practice, 16–19
  applied, 16
Sorokin, P., 263, 280, 392
Southard, E. E., 312
Southern states, 198, 224, 272
  conditions in, 141, 172, 228, 230, 232, 248, 267, 272
Spargo, J., 358
Spencer, A. G., 88, 102
Spencer, Herbert, 28, 102, 184, 390
Spencer's theory of universal evolution, 28–30
Spiller, G., 50
Standards of living, 147, 173, 187, 201
Starcke, C. N., 102
State charitable institutions, 303
Struggle for existence, 36–38, 40–47, 286
Sullenger, T. E., 341

Survival, social, 30, 38, 44, 48, 99, 101, 169, 181, 364
Sutherland, E. H., 341
Syndicalism, 354

Taft, D. R., 216
Taylor, C. C., 88, 281
Tenancy, farm, 271, 277
Thomas, W. I., 70, 102
Thompson, E. T., 242
Thompson, W. S., 188, 189, 241
Thomson, J. A., 50
Thorndike, E. L., 73
Thrasher, F. M., 342
Tibet, 110
Todd, A. J., 392
Tozzer, A. M., 102
Trade, 251
Tradition, social, 45, 58, 65–67, 77, 80, 377–379
Trotter, W., 73

Unemployment, 289–292, 305–310
Unemployment insurance, 306–308
Uniform divorce and marriage law, 148
Urbanization, 244–263
Urban population, distribution of, 247–249

Values, social, *see* Social values
Vance, R. B., 281
Variation, 35, 104, 286, 297, 315, 326, 328
Veddas, 97
Vice, 128, 130, 131, 142, 174, 227, 229, 256, 294, 297
Vital statistics, 167–172
  of Negroes, 230–231
Vocational education, 370–371

Wages, 84, 159, 173, 252, 285, 289–291, 305–310
Wallace, A. R., 27
Wallace, Henry, 273
Wallas, Graham, 392
Waller, W., 162
Walter, H. E., 50
War, 40–45, 108, 178, 292
  World Wars, 16, 166, 170, 178, 183, 199, 210, 345, 356
Ward, Lester F., 21, 194, 362, 368, 373, 383, 388
Warden, C. J., 73
Warne, F. J., 216
Warner, A. G., 311
Warner, H. S., 342
Washington, Booker T., 233, 236, 242
Weatherford, W. D., 242
Weber, A. F., 263
Weismann, 34, 397
Wells, H. G., 358
Westermarck, E. A., 96, 97, 99, 120
Wickersham Commission, 322, 323, 331, 337, 338, 339, 342
Wife capture, 108, 112
Wife purchase, 109
Wilder, H. H., 50
Willcox, W. F., 137, 139, 162
Williams, J. M., 281
Wines, F. H., 341
Winston, S., 50, 73
Wissler, C., 50
Wolfe, A. B., 189
Woman, position of, 106, 108, 112, 115, 126, 128, 132, 145
Woman's movement, 145, 146
Wood and Waite, 341
Woodworth, R. S., 73
Woofter, T. J., 242
Woolston, H. B., 264

Young, D., 216
Young, K., 73, 88

Zimmerman, C. C., 88, 263, 280
Zuñi Indians, 106