UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_148796
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—552—7-7-66—10,000

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 300 Accession No. P-G. 20

Author W23S.

Title The Social Sciences

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

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Problem Approach

By

PAUL A. F. WALTER, JR., *Ph.D.*

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

SECOND PRINTING

D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, INC.

TORONTO NEW YORK LONDON

NEW YORK
D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 250 Fourth Avenue, New York 3
TORONTO
D. Van Nostrand Company (Canada), Ltd., 228 Bloor Street, Toronto
LONDON
Macmillan & Company, Ltd., St. Martin's Street, London, W.C. 2

COPYRIGHT, 1949, BY
D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, INC.

Published simultaneously in Canada by
D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY (Canada) LTD.

All Rights Reserved

This book, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without written permission from the author and the publisher.

First Published May 1949
Reprinted August 1950

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GEO. S. FERGUSON CO. Philadelphia Pa.

This textbook has resulted from several years of experience in teaching Introduction to Social Sciences to freshman college students, and it represents an effort to meet some of the problems which such courses present. One of these is the confusing lack of unity and the unevenness of emphasis evident in most textbooks written by several experts in different fields. There are numerous advantages to such expert treatment, but for beginning students they are usually lost in the lack of integration among differing points of view.

Another difficulty arises from textbooks which stress current events and problems, and masses of statistics and factual data. As important as such treatment may be in gaining and holding the interest of students, it is more likely, it seems, to detract from the basic and lasting principles than to reveal or clarify them. Such material, too, is often obsolete by the time the book reaches the student, for changes in detail come so rapidly in our modern world as to outstrip the most rapid publishing processes. It would seem that a logical division of labor between textbook and instructor would place upon the instructor the task of keeping the class currently informed, and upon the textbook that part of the course which changes less rapidly.

For introductory social science courses, no textbook is complete in and of itself. Students should be introduced to other sources, and in the selection of supplementary reading materials the instructor may place such emphasis as he sees fit. Readings listed at the end of chapters are selected from what is most likely to be readily available even in small college and university libraries and to represent the various viewpoints of the different social sciences.

Attention is called to the terms listed at the end of each chapter. Systematic study of these terms should help materially in building the student's vocabulary and in providing him with necessary tools for clear thinking in relation to the materials covered.

The author wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the many works of others upon which he has drawn, including those which are cited in footnotes and listed among the readings, and many others which are not mentioned. Special acknowledgment is due to my colleague, Professor Lyle Saunders, for his encouragement and helpful suggestions throughout the period in which this book has been in preparation.

PAUL A. F. WALTER, JR.

Contents

CHAPTER PAGE

PART I—BACKGROUND

I. INTRODUCTION 3
The Social Sciences. Beginnings of Social Sciences. Malthusian Theory. The Study of Social Sciences. The Problem Approach. A Formula for Social Problems. Summary.

II. THE NEED FOR SOCIAL CHANGE 16
Problems of Cause and Effect. Basic Causes of Change. Human Populations. Natural Resources. Changing Technology. Cultural Change. Summary.

III. RESISTANCE TO CHANGE 33
Folkways, Mores, and Institutions. Why Societies Are Conservative. Resistance by Vested Interests. Change Despite Resistance. Summary.

IV. HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS 44
Human Prehistory. Western Civilization. The Industrial Revolution. The Process in England. The Industrial Revolution Elsewhere. Other Recent Developments. Summary.

PART II—SOCIAL PROBLEMS

V. THE PROBLEM OF WAR 61
War and the Need for Change. Resistance to Change. The Study of War. Political Science and War. The Economics of War. Sociology and War. Social Psychology and War. Summary.

VI. POVERTY 73
Poverty in the United States. Explanations of Poverty. The Business Cycle. Economic Security. The American Class System. The Study of Poverty. Summary.

VII. RACE AND ETHNIC CONFLICT 86
Racial Differences. Theory of Races. Sub-races of Man. Race Mixture. Race Psychology. The Racial Myths. Confusion of Concepts. Race and Ethnic Relations. The Assimilative Process. Summary.

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. CRIME AND DELINQUENCY 102
The Study of Crime. Statistics of Crime. The Family and Personality. Other Factors in Crime. Problems of Enforcement. Problems of Punishment. The Economics of Crime. Panaceas for Crime and Delinquency. Crime and Other Problems. Summary.

IX. THE CHANGING FAMILY 118
The Family as an Institution. Contributions of Anthropology. History of the Family. The Negro Family. The Family and Sex. Economics and the Family. The Family and Child Raising. The Family and Other Institutions. Summary.

X. HEALTH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS 132
"Socialized Medicine." Some Other Issues. Population Composition and Health. Changing Life Conditions. Special Phases of Health Problems. Relation to Other Problems. Health and Personality. Medical Research. Summary.

XI. URBANIZATION 145
The Ecology of Cities. Problems of the City. Rural Problems. Urban Dominance. Summary.

XII. PERSONAL MALADJUSTMENT 162
The Meaning of Personality. Development of Personality. The Adjusted Personality. Personal Maladjustment. Societal Causation. Roots of Maladjustment. Summary.

XIII. COMPETITION AND BUSINESS ENTERPRISE 176
Competition among Individuals. Business Enterprise. The Growth of Monopoly. Cooperatives. The Consumer. Depersonalization of Relations. The Role of Government. Summary.

XIV. LABOR PROBLEMS 193
Theories of Wages. Other Considerations. The Labor Movement. The Public Interest. The Role of Government. The Unorganized Worker. Summary.

XV. PUBLIC FINANCE 209
Governmental Budgets. Governmental Revenues. Non-Tax Revenues. Government Expenditures. International Finance. Summary.

CHAPTER PAGE

XVI. GOVERNMENT AND LAW 222
The Nature of Social Control. Types of Government. Democratic Government. The Nature of Laws. Governmental Interrelationships. External Affairs. Summary.

XVII. INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT 238
Examples of Political Unity. Political Parties. Special Phases. Pressure Groups. Extralegal Devices in Government. Summary.

XVIII. PUBLIC OPINION AND PROPAGANDA 255
The Nature of Public Opinion. The Media of Public Opinion. Manipulation of Public Opinion. Public Opinion and Government. Summary.

XIX. IDEOLOGIES AND MASS MOVEMENTS 267
Commonplace Ideologies. Economic Ideologies. Political Ideologies. Other Ideological Conflicts. Mass Movements. Summary.

XX. PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION 279
Universality of Education. Historical Development. Edution and Political Science. The Economics of Education. Sociological Aspects. Educational Opportunity. Summary.

PART III—APPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

XXI. SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES 295
Characteristics of Science. Science and Common Sense. Some Warnings. Relevance for the Student. Summary.

XXII. COMMON GROUND OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES 308
Unity of Human Life. Common Backgrounds. Unity of Method. Generalizations and Theories. Common Problems. Summary.

XXIII. DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SOCIAL SCIENCES 320
Anthropology. Economics. History. Political Science. Sociology. Social Psychology. Some Basic Differences. Summary.

XXIV. SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY 334
The Idea of Progress. Ends and Means. Some Dangers. Social Policy. Summary.

INDEX OF AUTHORS 345

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 348

Part I

Background

CHAPTER I

Introduction

A beginning student of the social sciences is interested in learning what these sciences are about, how they seek out and interpret facts, and what they have to contribute to his understanding and to human welfare. It is the purpose of this book to answer such questions, not completely nor exhaustively—for that requires a lifetime of study—but in sufficient detail to make him conversant with the several disciplines devoted primarily to the investigation of the processes and structures of organized group life. To become a social scientist, the student will find specialization and many years of study necessary.

For convenience, man's scientific works may be classified under three broad headings—the physical, the biological, and the social sciences. Examples of the physical sciences are physics, chemistry, and geology, which deal with nonliving things and forces. The biological sciences include botany, zoology, and physiology, the studies of plants and the animals, including man, and their reproductive, growth, and physical life processes. The social sciences, about which this book is written, deal with associations among people, the organizations and organized activities which constitute our group life.

Overlapping Studies. Although it is possible to distinguish among these broad classes of sciences in terms of what subjects are studied, the boundaries between them are neither sharply drawn nor static. The biologist is necessarily concerned with the chemistry of plant nutrition and the geological processes of soil formation. The geologist, in turn, studies fossil remains of plants and animals of past ages. The social scientist is concerned with the natural resources which support human group life and the laws of heredity. Such sciences as psychology and anthropology are partly social and partly biological sciences, whereas geography cuts across all three major divisions. Various authorities have differed in their classifications of particular fields of study, as might be expected.

This need not be confusing, however, if it is realized that classification is only for convenience in description and study and need not eliminate all doubtful cases in order to be quite useful. What we must keep clearly

in mind as we proceed is that social sciences are those which are chiefly concerned with *human group life* as distinguished from the purely individual life processes of the human organism.[1]

The Social Sciences

The social sciences which are the subject of this book are anthropology, economics, history, political science, social psychology, and sociology. The list is somewhat arbitrary and is subject to some critical disagreement. As has been previously noted, anthropology—"the science of man," in at least one important specialized phase, physical anthropology—could well be considered a biological science. However, the great present emphasis in anthropology is upon group life, and other aspects may well be considered as secondary. History is classed by some as a science, but others would include it among the *humanities,* with literature and the fine arts. We are concerned, however, with the part of history that is factual, systematic, and therefore, scientific. Social psychology is variously classed as a branch of psychology, a branch of sociology, and a science in its own right. The latter seems to be the interpretation which involves the least confusion and is, therefore, best suited to an introductory treatment.

The question is often raised as to whether any, or a particular one, of the social sciences is actually a science. Any answer to such a question is so much a matter of differing definitions of terms that it may provide an interesting exercise in logic without otherwise furthering the knowledge or understanding of the student. It is sufficient for our purpose to note that, at present, the social sciences are generally recognized as sciences and have adopted the aim, techniques, and rules common to all scientific study. Their aim is increased understanding through exact and verifiable knowledge, even though they have not achieved this in regard to all phases of their studies. Their methods have been the continuous search for facts, the relating of facts to other facts in order to reach valid conclusions, always in an atmosphere of the most searching self-criticism. They have been and are always alert for new devices by which their data may be measured and weighed and increasingly reduced to mathematical treatment.[2]

Anthropology. Each of the separate social sciences will be discussed in

[1] The over-all study of the sciences and their interrelationships belongs in the field of philosophy, primarily; but, as will be noted later, it also is of concern to a specialized phase of sociology known as the "sociology of knowledge."

[2] There are almost as many statements as to what constitutes a science as there are writers on the subject. The most general agreement among them lies in emphasis upon factual content and critical treatment.

some detail in later chapters, but a preliminary statement here will help the student in his grasp of the whole social science field and its problems. Anthropology—"the science of man" has been the study, largely, of primitive peoples of the world; but in recent years it has tended to become a comparative study of the culture patterns and configurations of all peoples, advanced as well as preliterate. Within anthropology there are several specialized sub-fields, such as prehistory, the study of the long period of human life before there were written records; archaeology, the study of the ruins of ancient communities and other objects which have survived to tell us the stories of very early cultures and civilizations; cultural and social anthropology, the study of the group ways of contemporary primitives, chiefly; and physical anthropology, the study of the somatic characteristics of races, both of the past and present. From this summation it can readily be seen that anthropology overlaps several other sciences—history, biology, and sociology, especially, and social psychology to some extent.

History. The social science most familiar to beginning students is history, the narrative of various human groups derived principally from written records. History provides much of the material for the other social sciences and overlaps them all. The specialized phases of history are the intensive studies of particular nations, peoples, or areas—as the history of the United States or the history of Asia; or the concentrated studies of particular periods or eras, as ancient history, medieval history, or modern history.

Economics. Economics studies the activities and organizations most closely linked with the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. Since its subject matter can usually be reduced to values in monetary units, or weights and measurements, economics has advanced furthest among the social sciences in developing statistical techniques, and thus has achieved greater definiteness and accuracy than other closely related disciplines. It overlaps phases of history, geography, and political science markedly, and, to a lesser extent, sociology and social psychology. There are many specialties within economics, some of which are the studies of economic history and economic resources; money, credit, and banking; wages and labor relations; business law; and public finance, or the revenues and expenditures of governments.

Political Science. The study of the forms and functions of governments, the bases and processes of formal law, and the political organizations and activities of peoples is usually called political science. Like history, political science is largely—but not entirely—based upon written records.

Political science importantly overlaps geography, history, and economics, and, to some extent, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. Some of its subdivisions include constitutional history and law; public administration and finance; political parties and movements; and, of increasing concern, international relations and law.

Sociology. Like anthropology, sociology is broad in its scope—the study of all forms of human relations. Because other social sciences, such as history, economics, and political science, have concentrated largely in the study of the phases of human relations which are recorded in documents of various kinds, sociology has tended to study principally the aspects of human relations which do not, usually, become a matter of public record. This is indicated by a listing of some of the specialties which are included in sociology—family relations, institutions, rural and urban life; but there are also overlappings as in the study of juvenile delinquency, criminology, and population.

Social Psychology. All social science eventually encounters problems of the "human element" for they are all studies of aspects of human behavior. This element is the especial preoccupation of social psychology, which studies motivation and personality insofar as they are products of associations among individuals and groups. The newest among the social sciences, social psychology has developed the fewest specialized aspects, but some may be noted—the genesis of human nature and personality, collective behavior, and phases of abnormal behavior. As previously noted, social psychology overlaps—is often indistinguishable from —psychology. It has much in common with sociology and anthropology and, to a lesser degree, the other social sciences.[3]

Beginnings of Social Sciences

The social sciences have been the group of studies to develop most recently as sciences, although, as far back as there are human records, we find that man has speculated about the arrangements in his group life. Most of this speculation was based upon casual observation and was strongly affected by superstition until fairly recent times—the last few hundred years—when beginnings have been made in more systematic factual study. Although various early writers, as far back as Aristotle, a philosopher of ancient Greece, contributed somewhat to scientific viewpoint, the true turning point is probably best represented in Thomas R.

[3] For more complete discussions of each of the social sciences, see *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (The Macmillan Co., 1935) under appropriate subject titles.

Malthus, an English writer of about 1800.[4] With practically no factual material at his command, Malthus endeavored a scientific appraisal of the prevailing social hypotheses of his time. His reasoning, now recognized as largely erroneous, was influential in shaping the work and theories of such molders of modern science as Charles Darwin, in biology; Adam Smith, in economics; and Herbert Spencer, in sociology. It also helped to establish the quantitative study of human populations as basic to all social science.

Malthusian Theory. Using the very inadequate factual material bearing on population behavior then available, Malthus worked out a mathematical formula, the import of which was to show that in the absence of natural checks on population growth, human populations rapidly tend to outrun food supply. Human populations, he said, increase by geometric progression under favorable conditions—1-2-4-8-16, etc., whereas food supplies increase only arithmetically—as, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. Thus, were it not for disease, famine, war, and other natural checks, any population would soon outgrow its sustenance. The theory, as such, is no longer considered of great significance—Malthus himself later modified it considerably—but it did pave the way for more solid development in social sciences than had previous loose speculations.[5]

Other Contributions. The Malthusian theory is taken as an example of many which might have been selected. During the nineteenth century there were numerous contributions to the factual approach to social understanding. It must be understood in appraising this pioneer work that those who were engaged in it lacked many of the data which are readily available to social scientists today and, therefore, needed to depend more largely upon logical inferences drawn from limited observations. Adam Smith, relying principally upon deductive reasoning, arrived at most of the postulates which underly present economics; whereas a succession of thinkers, such as Jeremiah Bentham, laid the groundwork for modern jurisprudence and political science.

Most of the development of social sciences has come within the present century; thus in maturity they lag considerably behind the physical and biological sciences. Their increasing exactness and certainty, however, give promise of even greater development in the future. The physical and biological sciences have provided the knowledge on which solutions to many human problems have been based. The means of

[4] See James Bonar, *Malthus and His Work* (The Macmillan Co., 1924) for further analysis of his important contribution to social science.

[5] Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Second Edition, 1935, Chapter II et. seq., gives a good current appraisal of Malthusian theory.

rapid transportation and communication, mass production in industry, improved agriculture and the breeding of better livestock, and the whole array of remedies of illness—these and many other benefits have come from science. The social sciences, however, as yet have contributed few answers to man's problems of human relationships; and those which they have suggested are tentative rather than certain. Although this is due largely to the newness of social sciences, it is partly due to the strong tendency of man to mix his feelings about human affairs with his purely factual findings—a tendency against which a student of social sciences must ever be on his guard.

The Study of Social Sciences

From what has been said, the beginning student will realize that he will find few simple, certain answers in the social sciences. In fact, many of the beliefs of which he is already certain will be questioned, because all of us are brought up in a set of cultural beliefs, many of which have scant factual basis but to which we have strong sentimental attachments.

A special difficulty in the study of social sciences lies in the terms which are used. Many of the terms are also used in daily conversation, but for the social scientist they often have somewhat different meanings. Such words as "institution," "society," and "culture" are examples. An institution in ordinary discourse may mean a building, such as a prison; or a business organization, such as a bank; or the pattern of relationships exemplified in the family. In social science, the word "institution," properly, may have but a single meaning—a traditional pattern of relationships and accompanying system of behavior, sanctified by long usage—it does not mean a building or a specific organization. The term "society," as most often used, refers to the elite, the "four hundred," or those who aspire to the prestige of "social" pre-eminence. In social sciences, "society" is an abstraction, referring to the totality of the patterns of relationship in any human group. The word "culture" usually, in everyday discourse, refers to the educational attainments and artistic appreciation of the few; whereas, in social science, it refers to all the common traditional possessions, whether material, technological, or esthetic, of the entire group.

A kindred difficulty lies in some inconsistency within social sciences in the use of terms, which calls for a questioning alertness at all times. The term "value," for example, has one meaning in economics, but a somewhat different significance in sociology and social psychology. "Law" is used in one sense by the political scientist, but in another by the economist.

The third difficulty lies in the fact that much of what is studied in social sciences has become a matter of popular controversy. In such areas

the temptation is to take sides, whereas a truly scientific approach calls for neutrality so that all facts may be carefully appraised, regardless of whether they support particular contentions. The whole history of prescientific social thought, which was mainly concerned with support of, or attacks upon, an existing *status quo,* clearly shows the futility of such approaches insofar as increasing knowledge is concerned.

Despite such difficulties as have been enumerated, and many others, the study of social sciences can be highly interesting and profitable. In their common subject matter they include the affairs which are of closest concern to each of us. Even though they lack the certainty and finality found in physical and biological sciences, to the careful student they offer much in the way of increased insight and understanding of his own life and the human events which occur about him, and serve as foundations for many types of specialized careers, ranging from social work to business administration.

Related Applied Fields. One type of classification of sciences divides them into "pure" and "applied" sciences. The former are those disciplines which are interested in fact finding and relating without regard to uses which may be made of discoveries beyond the increasing of understanding. The latter are concerned chiefly with practical applications of the findings of science to increase individual effectiveness and general welfare. The difference, in reality, is between relative remoteness and immediacy of aim rather than between the aims themselves, because the "pure" sciences, too, contemplate the ultimate utility of what they learn, and the applied sciences are constantly acquiring factual knowledge for which the immediate practical application is not always clear. The sciences discussed in this book are all, principally, of the "pure," or fact-oriented group, but there will necessarily be references to applied phases. The principal applications of anthropology have been, thus far, in colonial administrations, where advanced European peoples have undertaken to govern "backward" peoples in various parts of the world. In the United States, it has been largely in connection with the Federal administration of the affairs of reservation Indians. The applied phases of economics have been mainly in business administration, governmental finance, and personnel management, including the whole field of labor relations. Political science has had application in practical politics, jurisprudence, governmental administration, and diplomacy. Sociology and social psychology have had their chief applications in social work and the activities involved in the control and prevention of crime and delinquency. There is no field of "applied history," although applications of the facts of history are found in all fields of practical economic, political, and social endeavor.

Overlappings are commonplace in all the applied fields, and competence in any one calls for some background in all social sciences. The social worker, for example, is not only applying sociological and social psychological principles; he is also dealing with practical budgetary and other economic problems, with governmental administration and the courts, and, often, with relations of race and ethnic groups to which anthropological knowledge contributes. And, as in all applied social work, the history of the reform movements and legislative successes and failures of the past contribute importantly to the solution of immediate problems.

The Goal of Prediction. The application of social sciences to human affairs means the manipulation of causes to bring about foreseeable effects. This means that it is necessary to develop accurate foresight in the realm of human relations. Indeed, predictability is the ultimate test of the validity of all scientific endeavor. The social sciences are striving for such predictability and have achieved it with varying degrees of dependability and precision. The successful operation of health and life insurance companies is an outstanding illustration, for success is dependent upon the ability to forecast quite closely and over a considerable period of the time the death rates for various age groups and the proportions of populations that will be stricken by particular types of diseases. In recent times, economists have been concerned with more accurate prediction of business cycles so that the worst effects may be forestalled by timely measures. Criminologists have produced techniques for predicting the success or failure of parole as applied to individual cases. Students of family problems have developed scales for forecasting chances of success or failure of particular marriage unions. These are but a few examples to demonstrate the range of problems of prediction in human affairs. In later chapters many others will be noted.

It is probably true that, because of the many complexities involved, social sciences will never be able to foretell human reactions with the accuracy that other sciences achieve in non-human realms. Yet, it is erroneous to assume that human behavior cannot be predicted and that ever-increasing precision cannot be obtained. If the student will analyze his own experience with the point in mind, he will probably be greatly surprised to find how many of his own decisions and how much of his planning are based on his prediction of the thinking and actions of others and especially the extent to which those predictions work out reasonably well. The social sciences systematically endeavor to make prediction more accurate by basing it upon the greater factual knowledge and to extend it to a wider range of human activities.

Principles of Prediction. A few general principles underlying the development of predictive techniques will help in evaluating such efforts. Scientific prediction, like unscientific, is always, basically, the extension of the past into the future, even though such an extension may be modified by many considerations. A people who in the past have always spoken English will probably continue to speak English in the future. A corporation with a long history of paying dividends to stockholders will probably continue to pay dividends. A criminal who has repeatedly engaged in a particular kind of lawless behavior will probably continue to violate the statutes. In each case allowance must be made for changes in circumstances, but even such changes and their effects must be judged in the light of comparable changes in the past.

If the factual knowledge in each case is the same, more accurate predictions can be made for large numbers of people than for smaller numbers or single individuals. This is simply an application of the mathematical "law of large numbers" based upon the tendencies in large groups for deviants to cancel each other. An instructor with a large class may be unable to predict the performance of any particular student, but he knows fairly accurately how the entire class will perform. A sales analyst, without knowing how any given individual will react to a product, can often tell with some reliability how customers in the market will respond.

When other considerations are equal, predictions covering relatively short intervals are likely to be more reliable than those of longer periods. Even such erratic variables as styles of women's clothing can be predicted accurately weeks, or even months, in advance; but few things in the realm of human relations can be reliably forecast for a generation, much less for a century. The problems of predictability vary greatly from one phase of group life to another, as will be shown in later chapters, for human beings generally are more conservative in their attitudes and customs in some matters, and, conversely, welcome change in others; and some peoples are more conservative about all things than other peoples. Thus the whole task of increasing the precision and length of prediction is a highly involved one.

The Problem Approach

It is axiomatic to students of social thought that people become concerned about their societies when those societies fail to function smoothly and well. There has been no age in which there was such evidence of widespread concern over the malfunctionings of organized group life as there is in our own. When the accepted arrangements of human relationships and affairs are seemingly working well, the tendency is to take them for granted as the normal and natural order of things. But when the

feeling is widespread that things are not going well in many phases of life, people tend to analyze their group life and wonder if it cannot be improved.

It was awareness of social problems that gave rise, first, to philosophical speculation about society and, later, to social sciences. The same awareness has created the atmosphere in which social sciences have been tolerated and even stimulated. This close relationship between the interest in social problems and the analysis of social systems recommends the problem approach to the beginning student, because the generalizations and principles of the social sciences have greater significance when related to recognized inadequacies of existing schemes of things. For that reason this book deals first with social problems and some applications of social science to them and later presents a more complete description of each of the social sciences. The list of conditions which are recognized as social problems is much longer than that which is included for analysis in this volume. Those problems selected are a sampling of the most fundamental and persistent ones, which have been subjected to careful scrutiny and which lend themselves best to illustrating the accomplishments, possibilities, and limitations of the social sciences.

A social problem is a condition that seemingly constitutes a threat to the well-being of organized group life and that adversely affects large numbers of individuals. It is a condition that is considered as subject to control by concerted group effort, even though, usually, there is disagreement as to what the nature and direction of that effort should be. The condition recognized as a social problem is tied in with characteristic modes of individual and collective behavior that are brought into question when the problem is analyzed. This is a broad and flexible definition, but only such a definition will encompass the wide variety of social problems.

The Study of Social Problems. For a student of social sciences there are two extremes to be avoided in the study of social problems.

One extreme, and currently the most prevalent, is considering each problem in terms of itself, giving emphasis to its unique and peculiar features. This leads to extreme specialization to the point where a separate sub-science grows up around each social problem. This tendency has led to the amassing of much factual material but to little real scientific achievement. A fragmentary approach loses sight of the close interrelationships of all social problems. It is an approach which tends to increase confusion unnecessarily, especially for beginning students. For clear grasp of the social sciences, using the problem approach, the student must seek always the common elements in social problems as well as their unique features. Descriptively, it is easy to see the contrasts between

such phenomena as recurrent wars and the social stigma attached to feeble-mindedness, yet they have basic elements in common, as this book will repeatedly emphasize.

The other tempting extreme in the problem approach is the attempt made by some students to reduce all problems to a single one. Such efforts usually stem from doctrinaire preconceptions and imply a particularistic reform program to cure all the world's ills. To note that all social problems have common elements does not mean that any one of them is the cause of all others. The most common theories which represent these fallacies are mainly of two kinds—those that consider poverty and the mal-distribution of wealth as causative of all other problems; and those that consider failure of man to live up to certain religious beliefs as basic. The fact to be emphasized is that each social problem is related to others in cause and effect and in a number of complex ways. The problem for the student is one of seeing both the forest and the trees.

A Formula for Social Problems

As a device for helping to maintain unity throughout the discussion of various social problems, a formula which may be applied to each in order to bring out basic common elements is used in this book. It is one which can easily be remembered and which has pertinence to the understanding of the problems of all social sciences, once it has been carefully analyzed. The formula is:

Need for social change versus resistance to change gives rise to social problems.

At this stage the formula may best be considered as a working hypothesis, to be tested time and again in the examination of each social problem. Thus the student may himself decide upon both its validity and adequacy as a theoretical explanation of social problems and as the core concern of social sciences.

Such a brief statement, of course, is not intended to encompass everything that must be known about any one problem, nor to provide a simple, sweeping answer to all man's ills. As the next two chapters will show, behind the abbreviated formula lies a vast array of complex questions and facts calling for careful study.

Students agree that social problems arise from needs for changing existing social organization and processes as life conditions change. Old adjustments and accommodations, once considered adequate, become outmoded; and new ones are needed to take their place if groups are to survive and provide for the welfare of their members.

Need for change does not, in itself, however, explain social problems. If each needed change were promptly and wisely made, there

vould be no significant lasting maladjustments. But social changes, specially if sweeping in their nature, inevitably meet with resistance. This occasions a lag between the recognition of the need for change and ts accomplishment. This lag means strains within the social order and cute awareness of social malfunctioning—the realization of social probems. The resistance to change as well as the need for change is a component of the lag and resulting problems.

The formula for social problems, thus briefly explained, does not ommit us to any prejudgment on the wisdom or lack of wisdom in any particular proposals for change, nor on the various arguments advanced o support or denounce particular proposals. It serves simply as a conenient starting point for our analysis—one to which we may repeatedly heck back as we proceed. It leaves ample room for the discovery of other rinciples as they become apparent from facts.

Summary

The social sciences are systematic efforts to understand human relaionships in organized group life by the study of verifiable factual mateial. They are relatively new sciences and lack, as yet, the precision and ertainty of the more mature physical and biological sciences; but they re developing rapidly. They differ from social philosophy in that they re factual rather than merely speculative. The development of social ciences has come about from recognition of social problems in need of olution. A logical introduction to social sciences, therefore, is through he analysis of some of the more significant social problems. A basic ypothetical formula, introduced as a device to lend unity to the analyis of the various social problems studied, emphasizes the conflict between eed for social change and the inevitable resistance to such change, as mmediately causative.

Terms

Biological sciences
Humanities
Hypotheses
Institutions
Motivation
Personality
Philosophy
Physical sciences
Pre-literate
Science
Social Sciences
Somatic

Questions

1. State the formula given in this chapter to account for social problems.
2. What two extremes must be avoided in scientific study of social problems? Why?
3. What are the principles of prediction?
4. Distinguish between "pure" and "applied" social sciences.
5. What was the contribution of T. R. Malthus to developing social science?
6. List the social sciences, as given in this chapter.

READING LIST

American Journal of Sociology, Vol. L, No. 6, May, 1945. Entire issue devoted to recent developments in sociology and the social sciences.

Robert C. Angell, *The Integration of American Society.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941.

J. H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems.* Harper & Bros., 1934. Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4.

George A. Lundberg, *Can Science Save Us?* Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.

R. M. MacIver, *Social Causation.* Ginn & Co., 1942.

Howard W. Odum, *American Social Problems.* Henry Holt & Co., 1939.

Paul W. Paustian and J. John Oppenheimer, *Problems of Modern Society.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938. Chapter 23.

Thomas H. Robinson, *Men, Groups, and the Community.* Harper & Bros., 1940.

Paul Walter, Jr., "Man as a Social Being," in J. C. Knode and Associates, *An American Philosophy of Education.* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1942.

CHAPTER II

The Need for Social Change

The general formula for social problems given in the preceding chapter—the need for social change versus resistance to change gives rise to social problems—can be better understood if we examine carefully the reasons why social change is necessary. (By social change is meant significant alterations in the arrangements among groups and individuals through which they carry on group life processes—of work, play, procreation, artistic or scholarly endeavor, or any other organized activity.[1]

Such changes are taking place always, and in all phases of life.) If a great nation grants dominion status to a colony, the relationships between two large groups of people change. If a congress or parliament grants extraordinary powers to a president or cabinet, a working arrangement between groups is altered. If a labor organization gains a new contract with employers or a corporation enters bankruptcy, group arrangements are therefore different. If a juvenile gang is broken up by law enforcement officers, if a man deserts his family, or if a child grows to adolescence, human relationships are changed even though in a limited sphere. In fact, there are so many kinds of recurrent changes in relationships among people—as groups and individuals—that exhaustive lists of them would be impossible.

It is only when changes are on such a scale as to demand widespread recognition through their effects on great numbers of people that they are considered to be social change. Changes within the relationships in a single family having only slight effects on the social organization outside the family would not be so considered. But similar changes in the scheme of family life in a very large proportion of the families of a nation or several nations—as the general long-time trend toward smaller family units—are properly classed as social change. The setting up of a new type of curriculum in a single college might significantly affect relationships among students and faculty in that college and go unnoticed elsewhere; but the widespread adoption of such an innovation by a great number of colleges and universities might well be considered as significant social change, reflecting, and causing, in turn, new intellectual out-

looks which would imply new forms of arrangements among individuals and groups.

Problems of Cause and Effect

To the casual observer of the course of human affairs, changes in group life often appear capricious—events which occur because some individual or group impulsively wills them or because they "simply happen." To the social scientist, the wholly fortuitous has as little place in human affairs as it has in the ordered routine of planets and stars, or in the movement of tides in the oceans. It is their task, as scientists, to look behind social changes for the causes, both immediate and remote, which bring them about. Their working hypothesis must be, if there is to be any system to social sciences, that since change is apparently inevitable in human affairs, there must then be inevitable cause and effect relationships which once discovered will explain social changes. If such relationships are discovered, the prediction from causes, of effects, and of the direction, type, and magnitude of social changes becomes possible. This is the goal of the social sciences—accurate prediction of social changes, with the further implied goal of exerting control over changes by the manipulation of causes. These goals of prediction and control, social sciences share with all other scientific endeavors.[1]

The extent to which prediction and control have been achieved in the realm of human relations, the areas in which the task is yet to be accomplished, and the probable limits to these endeavors will be discussed in a later chapter. At this point it must be noted that cause and effect in human affairs are seldom simple relationships. It has been a consistent error throughout the history of the study of human affairs—whether or not that study has been scientific—to assume that simple answers are possible where very complex phenomena are involved. The social sciences necessarily call for the patience to sort out and study vast multitudes of facts which bear very involved, and often obscure, relationships to each other. A further complication lies in the fact that cause and effect operate in endless chains, for each effect in the realm of human relations becomes, in turn, a cause, related to other causes, operating to bring about new effects. There is no stopping point in history, nor in the evolution of societies. Whether in the life of the individual or the group, today is both the product of the long succession of preceding days and the starting of tomorrow and all future days.[2]

Basic Causes of Change

For general understanding of social change, basic causes may be

1 R. M. MacIver discusses the problem fully in *Social Causation*, Ginn & Co., 1942.
2 *Ibid.*

treated under a few headings, each of which, on close scrutiny, has many ramifications. The basic causes to be considered here will include population changes which bring need for constant revision of modes of organized group life; changes in natural resources from which populations gain their livelihood and fulfill their material wants; changes in technology which give new meanings to the word resources and which constantly modify group arrangements; and cultural changes involving new and different values and consequent shifts in relations of individual with individual, and of group with group.

Human Populations

The most tangible and measurable aspect of human groups is their existence as populations. As populations, groups may be reduced to numbers, and these numbers may be checked and verified, and their study, quantitatively, may be quite factual in that sense of the term. A class in college has a given number of students, and whoever will may count them to verify the fact. Of this number, so many are male and so many are female; a certain number are of one age and a certain number are of another; an exact proportion are of a given height and weight and other proportions are of other heights and weights. Such easily verifiable facts about the class as a population do not tell us all there is to know about the class, nor do they tell us, probably, what is most significant; but they do tell us something.

For larger populations—say, in the community, the region, the nation, or even the world—similar factual data can be ascertained, with varying degrees of reliability. Because verification is possible, and mathematical manipulations, such as comparisons, can be made, quantitative population studies provide social scientists with a firm factual basis for their investigations of the phenomena of group life.

For present purposes, the most significant observation which we can make from known facts of groups as populations is that they are always changing; and, by changing, they are always necessitating some changes in the human relationships within the group. Even for a college class, viewed as a population, there are apt to be significant changes in a brief term, because members may drop out of the class for one reason or another, or members may be added to a class. In the larger community, such changes are an everyday commonplace through births, deaths, and movements of people from community to community. Such changes often follow consistent trends over considerable periods of time with resultant needs for considerable alterations in relationships. A rapidly growing town or city finds need for frequent alterations in political, business, financial, educational, recreational, and other arrangements, as does a

town or city that is losing population. Undoubtedly the fact that for decades the population of France was at a practical standstill, numerically, while the populations of Germany, Italy, and Spain, her neighbors —were growing, had much to do with forming the course of recent European history. The fact that the population of Soviet Russia is now growing more rapidly than that of other great powers is a potent factor in shaping the history we are now living.

Population Growth. The present population of the world is about two billion people, probably a hundred or two hundred million more than that figure. The exact number cannot be known because very large and populous areas, as China, have no very reliable census data. This is, as far as we can tell, about double the population of the world a century ago.[3] The world population is growing, probably, more rapidly than ever before. It is generally assumed, because available evidence so indicates, that world population growth has been taking place throughout the life of man on this planet. It is interesting to ask the question, at this point, whether the rate of growth has always been as rapid as during the last 150 years—that is, doubling every century and a half. It has been calculated that at the same rate of growth as has characterized the period since 1800, humanity could have reached its present numbers in a few thousand years. As we shall see in a later chapter, there is convincing evidence that man, as a separate species, has occupied the earth for a much longer period, perhaps several hundred thousand years. This forces us to the conclusion that man's growth in numbers, throughout most of the human life span, has been much slower than now and in recent times; in other words, the present period of population growth is highly abnormal and unique.[4]

Nevertheless, now and into the foreseeable future, rapid growth in numbers is the rule. This means that previously uninhabited areas are becoming inhabited, sparsely peopled areas are becoming more densely populated, cities spring up and grow, and everywhere new arrangements in organized group life occur. Here is a tangible and reasonably predictable source of social change, even though, quite often, we cannot yet be sure just what all of the changes will be.

Birth and Death Rates. Why do populations grow—or, in what at present are exceptional cases—fail to grow? For world population the answer is simple. People are born, and people die. If more are born than die, population grows; if no more are born than die, the population does

[3] For generally accepted world population estimates, see Edward B. Reuter, *Population Problems*, J. B. Lippincott Co., Second Edition, 1923, p. 32.

[4] A. M. Carr-Saunders, *Population*, Oxford University Press, First Edition, 1925, pp. 8 ff.

not grow. Thus birth rate—the number of births per thousand population per year—and death rate figured on the same basis are the two variables involved. It is their relationship to each other that determines population growth or lack of growth. But note carefully, it is the relationship between the variables—not either one considered separately—that constitutes the cause. Many erroneous notions are based upon the casual assumption that birth rate alone determines population growth, overlooking the fact that death rate is equally important. In all populations for which we have reliable figures, rapid growth has been accompanied by declining birth rate—a fact overlooked by those who too readily assume that birth control offers an easy solution to the problems of growing population. The growth of populations in the last century and a half can only be fully understood by taking into account the rapid decline of death rates in that period. The extension of the life expectancy of individuals from about 30 years, to, in some countries, as high as 65 or more years has contributed as significantly to excess of births over deaths as have the births themselves.[5]

Just as the long-run trend of world populations has been, and will for some time continue to be, one of growth at an increasingly rapid rate, so are the long-term trends of birth and death rates downward. As between birth rates and death rates, in recent history death rates have declined most rapidly, thereby bringing about the accelerated rates of population growth.

Differential Rates of Increase. Some of the problems related to population arise not so much from the fact of rapid growth as from differential rates of growth for different peoples. Minorities become smaller or greater, and, at times, may become majorities. Weak and small nations become great and large, in terms of relative numbers. All such shifts in relative size of one population compared with others mean shifts in fundamental group relationships; and they are always occurring, although usually not rapidly enough to command the general attention they deserve.

Some trends of the day in world population differentials will demonstrate their significance for the present and future. The most rapid growth of the nineteenth century was among peoples of Western and Northern Europe and their descendants in other parts of the world. During that century their relative numerical position changed from a probable less than one-tenth of the world total to about one-fifth. As a concomitant of that changed position these peoples—the English, Irish, Dutch, Germans, French, and Scandinavians—pushed their economic,

[5] Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems,* McGraw-Hill Book Co., Third Edition, 1942, pp. 242 ff.

political, and cultural frontiers to every part of the earth so that, with the dawn of the twentieth century, they were the great imperial powers. Since the turn of the century these peoples and their descendants the world over have experienced a slowing of the rate of growth; whereas the lead in numerical increase was taken by peoples of Southern and Eastern Europe—the Spanish, Italians, peoples of the Danube Basin and the Balkans, and the Russians. At present these peoples are growing in numbers more rapidly than those of Northern and Western Europe and their kin.[6]

Keeping in mind that large populations grow when death rate declines more rapidly than birth rate we may advance a tentative rule for predicting future population trends. Those peoples whose birth and death rates are lower, and who therefore have the least room for further decline, will grow but slowly; those whose death and birth rates are highest will experience the greatest future declines in these rates. and probably will have the most rapid future growth. This, in application, would mean that the Caucasoid races (Europeans and their descendants) will grow less rapidly in the future than the Mongoloid and Negroid (the "colored" races) thus changing existing ratios and bringing changes in human relations which are based on present ratios and past trends. When one considers that the peoples of Asia, mostly Mongoloid, already constitute roughly half the world's population, some of the probable pressures for changed relationships become apparent, even though the precise form of such changes is not clearly predictable.

In application to the United States it must be noted that most of the minority racial and ethnic groups—not all—have higher birth and death rates than the great majority group of people who are fully assimilated; and, therefore, have greater potentiaities for future growth. Just as one example, the American Indian, until recently considered a "vanishing" race, although numerically a small group (about 350,000 out of 140,000,000) is probably growing in numbers more rapidly than any other racial group in the United States. This makes for necessary new adjustments which are keenly felt in some few areas of the country. The American Indians, for the most part, have comparatively high birth and death rates with the resultant possibility of rapid decline in both.[7]

Other Population Differences. Just as different peoples have significant differences in rate of numerical growth, so do they differ in sex composition and age-group ratios, and they exhibit various trends in these regards. As a general rule, those populations which have high birth and

[6] *Ibid.*, Chapters XV and XVI.

[7] *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior*, 1941, U. S. Government Printing Office, pp. 431 ff.

death rates are comparatively young peoples, with large proportions in childhood and young adult years. Those with low birth and death rates tend to be older populations, with relatively fewer children and relatively more old men and women. The population of the United States, for instance, is rapidly becoming a relatively old population. When, in 1900, one person in eight was more than 50 years old, now one in five is beyond that age. By 1980 it is estimated that the proportion may be one of three, which means many changes to care for the security of more and more of our people in the upper age bracket.[8]

Most large populations maintain, roughly, an equal number of males and females, but even slight changes in such ratios can be significant. One of the unexplained phenomena of population behavior seems to be that, where large numbers are considered, more boy babies are born than girl babies. Therefore, populations which are young are apt to have a preponderance of males. On the other hand, it appears from statistics available that, in large groups, women live longer on the average than men. It follows that in older populations, women are apt to be more numerous. Since property accumulation is largely affected by family inheritance systems and commercial insurance we see, as one effect, that as the population of the United States grows older, not only does the proportion of females rise, but property concentration is increasingly in the hands of older women. This has meant, and will continue to mean, readjustment in individual and group relations. Here, a word of caution, for it is easy to leap to conclusions from these trends which may be quite unjustified. A trend toward property accumulation in the hands of older women is only one of a number of interrelated trends and does not necessarily mean that a time will ever come when they will control our economy or own most of the property. Later chapters will indicate how many variables enter such problems and make precise prediction of such matters a very involved problem.

Extreme examples of disproportionate sex ratios can be found. For a considerable period of time the Filipino men resident in the United States outnumbered Filipino women by several hundred to one. In a country where interracial marriage is discouraged this meant, for the small group immediately involved, very acute problems of sexual adjustment, as the police court records of some California cities show. The number of men in the pioneering communities is usually greatly out of proportion to that of women. Such a disproportion in the period of the California gold rush led adventurous gold seekers to welcome with open arms the first Chinese immigrants who were quite willing to prepare meals, wash dishes, and launder clothes—tasks unsuited to men bent upon achieving sudden wealth. Such extreme cases tend to bring out in

[8] Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 287 ff.

high relief the social changes and problems which may come from distorted sex ratios, but they are relatively rare and of value mainly to focus attention upon some implications of trends in population composition.

Human Migrations. The examples given of the Filipino and gold rush pioneers in California are both of population conditions brought about by human migrations. Such migrations, historically and at present, enter into all population trends, sometimes as a minor, and at other times as a major, factor. In the nineteenth century more than 30,000,000 Europeans entered the United States, the largest migratory movement ever to occur in a comparable period of time, but only one of a whole series of migrations since the dawn of history. Such migrations have temporarily speeded the numerical growth of peoples in some areas and retarded it in others. They have upset, in given areas, existing proportions among racial and ethnic groups, age groups, and the sexes, and have tended to change, to some extent, trends in areas which were due simply to ratio of birth and death rates. We see the effects of large-scale migrations at the present time in the movements of southern rural Negroes to northern cities, which apparently is accompanied by radical changes in the birth and death rates of the migrating Negroes.[9]

For the present it will suffice to note a few important trends in connection with migrations. These trends are seemingly in opposite directions and may serve here to introduce the student further to the complexity of factors entering into human relations. First, we may note that mechanical means for transporting large numbers of people over great distances are greater, swifter, and safer than ever before. Likewise, the knowledge peoples have of the world has vastly increased in recent times, so that for many hundreds of millions of persons the advantages of other areas are better known. On the other hand, the man-made barriers to migration, such as rigidly drawn international boundaries and laws restricting immigration and emigration, have, in recent decades, multiplied rapidly. These opposing sets of forces do not necessarily balance each other, for, at present at least, the forces opposing large-scale migrations across international borders are the strongest, and such migrations have virtually stopped. There remain, however, tensions which develop, here and there, and occasion acute social problems. The recent history of Palestine and the Jewish attempts to open the area for freer immigration illustrate such a tension on a comparatively local scale.

As international migrations have declined, in most countries internal migrations have been increasing, bringing a train of necessary social changes. Such internal migrations have been represented in our own national history by the continuous movement of the population frontier

[9] Thompson, *op. cit.*, Chapter IX.

east to west; by the continuous movement of rural peoples to urban centers, and, recently, by population movements from the agricultural South to the industrial North and West.

Changes in population which follow somewhat consistent trends are forces which constantly make necessary new arrangements in human relations. But such forces can be understood fully only as they are interrelated with other forces. Although population trends may be discerned and predicted, it is dangerous to leap to hasty conclusions as to how they will effect human relationships until our picture is more nearly complete.

Natural Resources

Human populations do not exist in a vacuum. Man is a land-dwelling animal, very sensitive to extreme cold; thus human populations reside on land areas of the earth's surface and shun the polar ice-caps and other inhospitable regions. They depend, for continued existence, upon limited "natural resources"; and their welfare is closely linked to the abundance or lack of such resources. Any social arrangement is not only conditioned, to some extent, by size, composition, and trends of population, but also, to a further extent, by the availability of natural resources and ability to exploit them for human purposes.

Natural resources present some problems of analysis not found in the study of populations *per se*. The unit of a population is a living individual person; and what constitutes a living individual person is constant, from time to time and place to place. A natural resource is anything that man can use or convert to use; and what man can use varies with time, place, and circumstances. The great anthracite coal deposits of Pennsylvania are undoubtedly a natural resource to our present industrial civilization; but they were not, in the same sense, natural resources for the Indians who inhabited America before the coming of Europeans.

Of the great variety of physical materials which are of use to modern man, a number stand out as significantly important, largely because they have enhanced value due to their presumed scarcity and the inefficiency or great expense of substitutes. Valuations based upon such considerations, however, also change with time and place. Not far back in human history, first in such a list would have been the relatively rare metal, gold, which was the standard medium of exchange and therefore in great demand everywhere. In a previous period a similar value was placed upon certain rare spices and, at other times and places, upon salt. At present, probably at the top of lists of natural resources would come petroleum, important both as an economical source of power and for lubrication, as well as for a number of significant synthetic materials such as substitutes for natural rubber.

Accessibility of Resources. With such variables in mind, we may note that an important consideration in population studies is that human populations, through time, tend to be influenced in their distribution by accessibility of natural resources. Here, again, however, natural resources are only one of many factors affecting population distribution; and at any given time the distribution is such that very unequal shares of the world's resources are available to different people. Lack of mobility, a sense of belonging to a particular place, and, most especially, the factor of ownership of property and land areas by some to the exclusion of others enter significantly into such inequalities.

The vital natural resources of the present time fall into two broad classes, with an indefinite middle group rather than a sharp line dividing them. There are some—such as the air we breathe, the general supply of water, the minerals and fish in the sea, and low-grade coal—which are, for practical considerations, inexhaustible. There are others—such as petroleum and growing timber—whose exhaustion is apparently near enough to cause grave concern.

Of the "inexhaustible" resources, with the single exception of air, it is important to note that, although general world supplies may be plentiful, the supplies accessible to given groups of people may be limited, rapidly shrinking, or even nonexistent. A part of the accessibility of resources lies in owning them, or the area from which they may be obtained; and such ownership may change hands through a variety of means, ranging from purchase, gift, or inheritance, to outright seizure by force of arms. Generally speaking, those groups which at any time have command of the most resources are in the best position to gain control of more resources because they are better equipped to buy or seize them. Much of the world's history has been the story of the competitive struggle of groups for control of natural resources.

Soil Fertility. One type of natural resource which affects the supplies of many other kinds is worthy of special notice—fertility of the soil. Until recently in our national history soil fertility has been looked upon as an inexhaustible resource. Of recent years we have become increasingly aware, as peoples of other areas of the world have been for centuries, that soil fertility can be exhausted, and with surprising rapidity. Since very early in human development the production of food from land has been an important and necessary activity. The economy of the production of growing and living things is such that, when systematically pursued, it upsets the "natural balance" of the biological universe. Carefully calculated practices of crop rotation, fertilizing, and flood control are required if the fertility of land is to be maintained or increased at the same time

that land is used for production. Vast areas of the various continents, notably Asia, have already been lost to agricultural production due to lack of such practices. Similarly, considerable areas in the United States have been denuded of their best soil, and there is danger that even larger areas will be lost to productive use.[10]

Resources, Population, and Social Change. The general trends of history have been toward a decline in the total amount of natural resources as population has grown; but this has been more than offset by an opposite trend in making existing resources more readily accessible and in the development of "new" resources through finding ways to utilize what previously had not been regarded as natural resources. These trends have affected the ratio of population numbers to natural resources in such a way as to necessitate changes in social organizations. They are reflected in the phrase, "rising general standard of living," meaning that, statistically, there are more material goods per person, with which to satisfy human wants, than previously. As general living standards rise, so relations among people change, necessarily. Especially is this true because increased accessibility of useful things differs widely from one group to another. Whereas some groups experience rapid rise in living standards, many large groups are scarcely touched by the trends and remain relatively poverty stricken. Although the peoples of Europe and North America gained greater control over more natural resources, the great masses of Asia, Africa and most of Latin America remained at low levels of poverty.

Population growth is a factor in the distribution of natural resources. Where such growth has taken place without a corresponding increase in accessibility of resources, "over-population" occurs, which in turn tends to impoverish the people—a condition found in large parts of India and China. But it is equally true that accessibility of natural resources affects population trends. A high general living standard brings declines in both birth and death rates, thus speeding growth in numbers until these rates reach a low point from which they can no longer decline rapidly.

Natural resources, like population numbers and composition, vary. They change in plentifulness and accessibility to groups. These variations are also basic causes of social change, and are closely related, as cause and effect, to changes in population. The ratios of resources to populations, measured by general living standards, are a primary force in making for new arrangements in organized group life.

---

[10] Some authorities estimate that one-third of the arable land of the United States has already been lost to erosion. For a good nontechnical summary of the problem, see Karl B. Mickey, *Man and the Soil,* International Harvester Co., Chicago, 1945.

Changing Technology

So important to men everywhere has been the ratio of numbers of people to accessible resources—the general standard of living—that they have devoted much of their cooperative efforts to deliberate and elaborate schemes for altering that ratio. Some of these efforts have been directed chiefly at controlling numbers by birth control or the practice of infanticide. Such efforts are usually more than offset, however, by those aimed at preserving and prolonging individual lives and have had little effect, in themselves, in altering the ratio. By far the greatest efforts, and the most effective, have gone into making resources more accessible and discovering new resources. The devices and knowledge expended to this latter end constitute technology, which increasingly throughout history has been a factor making for social change.

Invention. The basis of technological development is invention, or the devising of a new, and supposedly better, way of accomplishing a specific purpose. Inventions, if demonstrably successful, tend to be imitated by others interested in the same or similar specific objectives and thus to be diffused throughout groups. This process of diffusion may spread their use to other groups. Of course, there are limitations upon imitation and diffusion, as will be further discussed in later chapters.

Important to the development of technologies is the fact that nearly all inventions are modifications, readaptations, or combinations of previous inventions. Each new invention, in turn, may open the way for, and suggest one or several, more. Thus inventions tend to increase in number and variety through time; and technologies, once developed, give promise of greater and faster development provided circumstances are favorable and the culture of a group is receptive to innovations. The discovery of practicable methods of releasing atomic energy was dependent upon hundreds of previous discoveries, and, once made, suggested scores of applications in various fields.

At early stages in technological development, invention is largely a hit-or-miss affair; but, in more advanced stages—as we now find it in our own society—it is a very systematic undertaking of individuals and groups of highly trained experts whose production is highly efficient. All this makes for a constantly accelerating pace of innovation and helps to maintain not only a receptivity toward technological advance, but its acceptance as a matter of course.

Inventions, singly and cumulatively, work in conjunction with the forces already discussed—population change and the growth or shrinkage of accessible natural resources—to make necessary social changes through cre

standards, increasing leisure, improving or deteriorating health, and in other ways. The general world trends are toward a spread to wider groups of technological improvements, and the multiplication and speeding of inventions, with resulting strains on old and rapidly outmoded systems of human relationships. Increased leisure for housewives has changed familial relations; speed and ease of transportation have changed community structures; air conditioning and heating methods have made previously uninhabitable areas habitable; better lighting has changed old rhythms of daily life. Examples could be listed for many pages without exhausting the changes which recent inventions have brought to social organization and routines.

Cultural Change

Technological change, so marked in our own group life, and in other groups much like our own, is both cause and effect of many other kinds of change. New developments in productive methods and devices bring new elements into a people's language. Perfection of the automobile as a popular means of transportation brought into common usage scores of terms—chassis, chauffeur, wheel-base, carburetor, etc.—many of which have developed meanings quite apart from the automobile itself. It caused to be placed in our statute books dozens of new laws, such as traffic and speed regulations. It changed architecture to the extent of popularizing the garage bungalow and similar types of structures. Even church services have, in many instances, been so scheduled as to leave ample time for the Sunday afternoon drive. It has certainly changed human values and, according to many critics, has altered standards of sex morality. It has been responsible for changes in relations between employers and workers. In turn, each technological advance depends, in varying degrees, on cultural changes which have made it acceptable. The changes in thinking and relationships attendant upon the Second World War paved the way for discovery of methods to release atomic energy at a cost which, under other circumstances, would have been prohibitive. In the case of the automobile, many previous developments which had made fast, dependable transportation desirable meant that the new development could be more than a novelty and a toy of a few daring, wealthy people.

Technological change is only one phase of a many-sided process of change—including changes in language, values, attitudes, ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving, many of which have no direct technological significance. All these may be included in the broader, and necessarily more vague, term—cultural change.

Meaning of Culture and Cultural Change. The term "cultural change" introduces a problem which runs throughout the study of social sciences. As noted in the previous chapter, many of the terms of the social sciences are words which are used conversationally in daily intercourse; but in social sciences they have a somewhat different meaning. Culture (cultural) is such a term. To most people not conversant with social sciences and their terminology, "culture" refers to a few particular attainments—advanced education and esthetic abilities and appreciation—which are the property of only a few members of the group. To the social scientist, the culture of a people refers to all their common ways of acting and thinking—their customs, traditions, and techniques, together with their material equipment and modes of organization. The approved method of planting corn or mass production of machines is as much a part of a people's culture as is the enjoyment of opera or modernistic painting.

Cultural change, then, is all change in the characteristic life ways, material equipment, schemes of organization, and ways of thinking and feeling. Cultural change is usually slow in its less material aspects, as following chapters will explain, but it is persistent and continuous. As was previously noted, cultural change is both cause and effect of other kinds of change. One of the sweeping cultural changes of recent times in our group has been that in the status of women, reflected in their admission to equal educational opportunities with men, a vast increase in the range of their occupational opportunities, the right to vote, hold public office, and to serve on juries, as well as an equal place with men in family councils. This important change has altered social structure at many points, as in the family, the community, state and nation; it brought innovations in political, economic, and educational relations; it resulted in changed attitudes and values in many fields, from that of merchandising to that of morality and religious belief.

Culture Borrowing and Diffusion. Social invention, or deliberate innovation in the forms of human relations, is less significant as a factor in general cultural change than is invention in the limited field of technology (one phase of cultural change). Much more important are the processes of borrowing and diffusion of cultural elements. Each distinct group of people develops its own culture, in some ways like, in others different from, the cultures of other peoples. When two or more peoples come into contact with each other there immediately begins a process of interchange of unlike culture elements. Each group will tend to borrow from the other groups those techniques and ideas which can be readily assimilated into their own existing culture. Since no people lives in complete isolation from peoples with differing cultures, this process of borrowing and diffusion is always taking place. The rate of interchange of cultural

elements, or acculturation, varies greatly, but it is a part of the experience and a source of social change in all groups.

When Europeans first founded colonies in America they found themselves in contact with Indians who had quite different cultures—that is, ways of living, thinking, and feeling—and during the centuries of this contact there was a lively interchange of cultural elements. The Indians borrowed the horse and its use as a means of transportation, firearms, new words and phrases, and, in some cases, Christianity, among many other cultural elements. These brought great changes in the whole social organization of the Indian groups. The Europeans and their descendants borrowed from the Indians new agricultural methods and plants, modes of hunting and warfare, many words and terms, architectural ideas, and other cultural elements, reflected, although to a lesser degree, in social changes among the colonists, some of which persist to the present time.

During the nineteenth century, millions of immigrants came to America, bringing new and strange ways; and, as they settled on farms or in cities, cultural borrowing was brisk. In fact, basically, the whole of American culture is compounded of a wealth of borrowed cultural elements, from the English trial-by-jury to Chinese cookery. All this has meant a continuous ferment of cultural and social change in American life, perhaps without parallel in the history of man.[11] The cumulative effect has been so to accustom the people of the Americas, especially those of the United States, to change that the anticipation and acceptance of change have themselves become outstanding cultural characteristics. To be considered "unprogressive" among us is often equivalent to being somewhat wicked or antisocial.

Differentials in Cultural Change. When peoples in contact set up an interchange of cultural elements, the exchange is usually unequal. Peoples differ in their readiness to accept alien ways, in the richness and variety of cultural elements that they have to offer in the exchange, and in the aggressiveness with which they proselytize their ways and ideas. The general and long term trends have been in the direction of more rapid and wider diffusion of cultural elements over the entire world, and especially from a few outstanding cultural centers—notably Europe and North America. In previous historic epochs other culture centers, as Egypt, Greece, and Arabia, were the principal centers of culture diffusion, but under such limited conditions of transportation and communication that the process was much slower and reached relatively fewer peoples than the process as we see it on every hand today.

11 Carl Wittke, *We Who Made America,* Prentice Hall, 1940.

The facility and range of culture diffusion today bring about paradoxical results. On the one hand, they tend to make for uniformity in practices and social organization, because all peoples are exposed to, and often under pressure to accept, standardized practices. On the other hand, it makes for an ever-increasing variety, for with all of the world's cultural elements increasingly available to all peoples, the variety of combinations and adaptations of cultural elements becomes infinite.

Summary

Basic causes which make continuous social change necessary for all peoples fall into several groups: the changes in numbers and composition of population; changes in supply and accessibility of natural resources; changes in techniques for exploiting resources, or technology; and cultural changes due mainly to borrowing and diffusion of cultural elements among alien groups. Although, for convenience in analysis, these sources of social change may be considered separately, they operate in complex cause-and-effect interrelationship with each other. Their combined long-run effects have been changing life conditions which, in turn, demand ever-increasing changes in group life organization and processes. This provides the basis for the first part of the formula which underlies all social problems, the ever-present need for social change.

Terms

Technology
Census
Birth rate
Death rate
Differential rates
Caucasoid
Mongoloid
Ethnic
Sex ratio
Migration
Over-population
Cultural
Culture borrowing
Culture diffusion

Questions

1. List the kinds of basic causes which make unending social change necessary.
2. Does a population with a high birth rate necessarily grow more rapidly than one with a lower birth rate? Explain.
3. The meaning of the term "natural resources" differs from time to time and place to place. Why is this?
4. Can you give an example of culture borrowing? Of culture diffusion?
5. What social changes are taking place in colleges and universities?
6. How does need for social change enter into social problems?

READING LIST

James Truslow Adams, *The Epic of America*. Little, Brown & Co., 1931.
Harry Elmer Barnes, *Society in Transition*. Prentice Hall, 1939.
Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*. The Macmillan Co., 1933.

Oscar Cargill, *Intellectual America: Ideas on the March.* The Macmillan Co., 1941.
Joseph K. Folsom, *Culture and Social Progress.* Longmans, Green & Co., 1928.
Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown: A Study of Contemporary American Culture.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.
Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition; A Study in Cultural Conflicts.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.
Howard W. Odum, *American Social Problems.* Henry Holt & Co., 1939.
William F. Ogburn, *Social Change.* Viking Press, 1938.

CHAPTER III

Resistance to Change

The discussion of social change in the preceding chapter has emphasized its universality and the fact that, through unique national experience, Americans have become accustomed to expect and welcome change. Upon inquiry into the nature of culture, and of human societies which are the carriers of culture, it must be noted that both are fundamentally conservative. This is true of all societies and cultures; and, when we say that one of our cultural characteristics is readiness to accept change, we find implied a basic contradiction. Our acceptance of change, although marked by comparisons with other peoples, is acceptance within limits. We are quite ready as a people to adopt new automobile designs as long as the product looks and drives like that considered by us as "natural" in automobiles. Otherwise, as automotive designers well know, we are apt to reject the novelty. Strange kinds of food are exciting so long as they are not too strange. The old American ways of our forefathers are better than "new-fangled" "foreign" "isms." The old home remedies persist side by side with the latest medical techniques. We insist upon and yet resist change.

Nor are we as a people exceptional in this, although we may be the outstanding example. It is a type of contradiction, with resulting social strains, to be found in all cultures and all groups, but in varying degrees. Better, perhaps, than any other writer, William Graham Sumner has described the clinging of culture groups to ways and thoughts of the past.[1] It is from past generations that we get nearly all our approved customs and ideas, and current generations add but comparatively little to them. In meeting new situations, we are inclined to turn first to past experiences and lore for guides. The notions and practices we hold most sacred are those with the greatest antiquity, not the experimental innovations of our own day. We like for our "progressive" politicians to hark back to Jefferson and Lincoln; we often prefer to deal with conservative bankers; there is a tonic effect in the "old-fashioned" Christmas; and the religion of our fathers is the soundest.

Because we as a people have become "change-minded" it is easy to

1 *Folkways*, Ginn & Co., 1907. See especially pp. 87, 95.

forget how basically conservative we are unless it is brought forcibly to our attention. Both as individuals and in our group desires, tastes, and actions, we cling to the old to the extent that culture is often likened, by loose analogy, to individual habit.

Folkways, Mores, and Institutions

Terms used by social scientists to describe social structure and cultural phenomena reflect the strong hold of the past upon current practices and thought. From Sumner we have the term *folkways,*[2] which has reference to ways of doing things widely characteristic of a culture group, originating in trial-and-error experimentation as new situations arise, but, once generally adopted, handed down from generation to generation and persisting through long periods of time. *Mores*[3] are the particular folkways to which have become attached, through time, high moral significance. They are considered the right, the natural, and compulsive ways of acting in particular situations and usually imply social penalties for violations. The mores gain sanctity with age and present, by their very nature, the strongest kind of opposition to change in the realms in which they operate. Among the mores of our culture are those relating to strict honesty in money dealings, fidelity in family relations, and patriotism in time of war; and it is unthinkable that anyone should seriously suggest radical changes in these requirements.

Both folkways and mores show considerable uniformity within a culture group, but they vary widely from culture to culture. What is condoned by the folkways of one group may be emphatically condemned by the mores of another. Infanticide, which has been practiced in many places, and with social approval among many peoples, is considered criminal and sinful by other groups. Margaret Mead found that among Samoan people to attempt to excell one's fellows in public was considered disgraceful.[4] Even though there is relative uniformity in mores within our own culture, there are also differences and conflicts as among the notions of what is fitting and right held by peoples of different socio-economic classes, ethnic backgrounds, and between rural and urban groups. Despite all these inter- and intra-cultural contrasts, every mos (singular of mores) has attached to it notions of absolute correctness which make it highly resistant to efforts to alter it.

Institutions. In the description of social structure, a key term is *institution.* As explained in the introductory chapter, the word has a meaning in the social sciences somewhat different from that which it often carries

2 *Ibid.*
3 *Ibid.*
4 *Coming of Age in Samoa,* William Morrow & Co., 1928.

in ordinary discourse. As commonly and unscientifically used, the term may refer to a building, a specific organization, or a place of confinement for social misfits. In social sciences, institution means an elaborate pattern of predetermined activities with their appropriate patterns of organization (as distinct from the organization itself) which is widely recognized and followed throughout a culture group; and, significantly, sanctified by antiquity. Each institution is reinforced by appropriate folkways and mores and tends to perpetuate existing practices. Examples of institutions important in our social structure are marriage, trial by jury, commencement exercises, and installment buying. Although changes take place in all of these, each change is resisted, and radical changes are widely opposed. The abolition of institutions is in most instances almost impossible, although, through time, some do disappear.

The acceptance and participation in institutionalized activities are a large part of the training of individuals for group life. Such activities become the basis for individual life plans and involve persons in long-term commitments with other persons; in this way they give direction to life for both the individual and group. Serious disruption of institutional patterns means corresponding life disorganization.

In our thinking we group institutions which serve the same supposed or real functions into clusters, such as familial, economic, political, etc. The institutions included in such a constellation tend to be closely integrated and mutually supporting in, among other things, opposition to changes. Different institutional clusters also tend to be mutually supporting, as in the case of the familial, the economic, and the political, where one's dependents, the job and the law, all help to routinize certain of life's activities and stabilize goals. This mutual support serves the purpose, largely, of resisting wide or sweeping innovations throughout the social structure.

The reinforcement of each other by various institutionalized phases of life gives rise to the phenomenon often referred to as the "cake of custom." This "cake" represents the strength not only of one set of convictions, but of all the stable elements of group life in checking reform. Due to it, the conventional and accepted ways not only of acting, but also of thinking and feeling, are the path of least resistance in most affairs and therefore tend to be followed by the individual. Other courses or notions, contrary to tradition, usually involve difficult and painful obstacles even though they may appear to a particular person as quite reasonable. Conformity is a saver of time and energy and is thus expedient. The following of accepted modes in most of life's activities saves the time and energy necessary for the pursuit of the more meaningful objectives in a busy lifetime. The same conformity, in turn, lends support to the traditional elements of group ways.

Why Societies Are Conservative

The essentially conservative nature of societies and cultures is universal and cannot be accounted for as fortuitous and meaningless, regardless of how impatient we may become at times with the resistance to particular changes. The prime function of any society must be the survival of the individuals who are the carriers of its traditions. Individuals survive only when there is regular and dependable assistance, cooperation, and protection from others and the group. The fiction of the pre-social man [5] who, alone and unaided, matched power and wits with nature to live a robust life, is just that—fiction. The individual human, born a helpless babe, lacking the strength, speed, protective coloration, and other attributes valuable for individual survival found in many lowlier animals, is utterly and completely dependent upon continuous contact with organized society. Nowhere in all human history do we find a single authenticated case of an individual human being who lived for any significant period of time by his own unaided efforts.

Importance of Predictability. If a society is to function it must be orderly, and social order is based upon predictability. While it is commonplace to stress the unpredictability of human nature, a little careful observation and analysis will reveal the companion truth that, while much in human affairs is unforeseeable, a very large part of the behavior of persons, individually and collectively, is quite accurately predictable. The members of a class and their instructor are scheduled to meet at a certain time and place, and it is highly predictable that they will so meet. The businessman plans in the expectation that other businessmen will follow certain common routines, and he is able to continue in business because his predictions are accurate. The person who accepts money for valuable goods or services predicts that others will sell or hire to him for money, and thus out of dependable prediction arises the value of money. One could continue in this vein indefinitely to illustrate the part played by accurate prediction in the social order. All routine is simply highly predictable behavior of individuals and groups, and without it societies would vanish and individuals die. As one writer has said:

> . . . A social group cannot maintain itself on a basis of day-by-day trial-and-error adjustment. The activities of today must be planned in terms of their effects upon tomorrow. Consequently, a social plan must be devised. Such a plan serves to reduce human dependence

[5] The notion of the pre-social man is an ancient one, but enters importantly into modern social thinking through the work of the "social contract" theorists, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and J. J. Rousseau, who attempted to explain the origin of human societies by positing a period in human history when there was no organized group life.

upon trial-and-error and to make individual behavior a contribution to collective long-run welfare.[6]

What makes dependable prediction possible is recurrence of sequences of events. If the same sequence has happened over and over in the past it may well be expected to recur in substantially the same way in the future. Conversely, if something has never happened before, or has happened infrequently or undependably, there is an inadequate basis for prediction and therefore for planning one's own activities. No matter how attractive and logical novel plans may seem, we cannot be sure just how they will work until they have been tried repeatedly. Even an automobile built carefully according to paper plans and specifications must go to the proving ground to make a record of achievement before it can safely be released on the market. Especially in the sensitive realm of human relations are the penalties of faulty prediction great, so that in them long test in operation is greatly valued as the source of wisdom.

Social Order. The need for social order based upon a high degree of predictability is the principal explanation of the essential conservatism of societies. Only as past activities and relationships repeat themselves can we act confidently in the present and plan for the future. The alternative is experimentation and doubt. With the wide range of activities in which all of us engage, it is possible and even stimulating to advance on uncharted paths in a few closely restricted areas, but only when we feel that in most of our living arrangements we are secure. The explorer likes to have the same old community, and family circle, and a comfortable income to which to return. Prevailing social order is so much a part of our expectations that it is only in its absence that we are fully aware of it.

Disorder in society results when the actions of many persons in many kinds of activities become unpredictable. Violent social change brings disorder which persists until old patterns are restored or new patterns have shown by repetition that they are dependable bases for acting and planning. Order in social relationships is known by many names as the reference is to various fields, but the meaning is substantially the same. Stability is considered a virtue in governments as contrasted with instability. A good credit rating is prized in economic realms. Faithfulness is valued in family life, as opposed to infidelity. Steadiness is prized in workers, loyalty in followers, consistency in leaders, teamwork in sports—and in each case the implication is clear. You

[6] Richard T. LaPiere, *Collective Behavior.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938, p. 65. Quoted by permission of the publisher.

know what to expect of persons and organizations because of their past performance in the particular regard in which judgment is being passed.

Much of the resistance to change which arises from the need for social order is not usually thought of as conservatism. What has been "tried and true" (therefore predictable) in group experience through generations is simply considered "natural" by group definition, and the defense of existing practices becomes a matter of pointing out what is "normal"; alternatives are unworthy of consideration. Or resistance to the new may be a matter of unconscious habits of conformity to established ways, and being "unthinking" no issues are raised in our minds. An array of such habits and ready-made group definitions of what is normal and natural serve as the balance wheel of organized group life and of individual lives as well. Without them it is difficult to conceive of what either group life or individual life would be like, for everywhere that we encounter human beings, we find them.[7]

Resistance by Vested Interests

Unless we recognize the change-resisting functions of folkways, mores, and institutions, our attention is apt to become unduly focused upon the relatively less important, but more deliberate, phases of that resistance. Such resistance is usually generalized under the term "vested interests," which are matters of expediency rather than traditional compulsives. Vested interests are often personified and caricatured as Wall Street bankers with dollar symbols on their vests, or as well-fed politicians—individuals who conspire against the common good which is identified with desired changes.

Such common distortions of the significance of deliberate opposition to social changes contain in them, undoubtedly, some element of fact, but they serve to obscure much more fundamental truths. Every person who troubles to analyze his own situation will find that he has many vested interests in the social arrangements from which he draws his nourishment and satisfactions. This is equivalent to saying that there are many things in our society which must remain relatively unchanged if persons are to live and if living is to be worth while. The man with a single dollar has a vested interest in things remaining sufficiently as they are that others will exchange goods and services for the dollar. The man with a million dollars in bonds has a vested interest in things remaining sufficiently like they are that he may regularly collect interest on the bonds during their life, and his principal investment upon their maturity. There is a difference, obviously, between the interests of the two

[7] For fuller development of this analysis, see "The Fields of Behavior," Chapter IV, in Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, *Social Control,* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.

men, but it is one of degree, not of kind. Vested interest is frequently thought of in connection with party politics, where the holder of an office which carries with it large remuneration, power, and prestige has an interest in his party remaining in power. Not usually classed as a vested interest, but similar in principle, is the expectation of a home owner that government will remain sufficiently as he has been accustomed to it that, if his house catches fire, he can telephone the fire department and depend upon its coming speedily to his aid.

Rights as Vested Interests. In the last example given we might say that the house owner has a right to protection against fire. From this it is but a step to the further proposition that all rights enjoyed by individuals and groups, whether they are rights of property, or freedom of speech, or to trial by jury, are vested interests; and they exist only so long as the social arrangements out of which they grow remain relatively unchanged. The rights upon which most of us are most insistent are traditional rights, meaning that they come down to us from the past. Where these rights are threatened we resist change deliberately, which again emphasizes the essentially conservative nature of society. Deliberated resistance to change may be dramatized as a group of people labeled "vested interests," but a much truer conception is that such resistance is universal and grows out of a common vital stake in keeping most things much as they are.

The subordinate truth is that there are numerous instances in which there is conflict between the interests of a few individuals or small groups and the interests of the larger group of which they are a part. Such conflict at times takes the form of resistance by the few to reforms desired by the many, which may delay such reforms or entirely prevent them. In such cases there are vested interests on both sides, for "majority rule" and the "common good" are expectations which have their roots in dependable social order in democratic societies.

Social Stratification. Security in social status is a preoccupation of all people, and devices to insure it are found in all societies. Among such arrangements is the universal stratification of persons in different social classes with some limitations upon rise and fall in the social scale. Even in our own open-class society where the limitations are relatively flexible, we have social classes, and once a favorable position is achieved in the social scale we strive to protect ourselves in it. The wealthy and socially prominent family will resist changes which threaten its prestige, just as the struggling family of the unskilled laborer will resist changes that would throw it into the pauper class. Even among beggars there are gradations of status and prestige which may be defended as diligently

as are listings in the *Social Register.* Both those who have some advantage of status to defend and those who hope to rise to higher status have a kind of vested interest in the general *status quo,* since in a very different scheme of things the positions they occupy or hope to achieve become meaningless. A principal source of resistance to social change lies in the scheme of stratification which prevails in any particular culture. Where rigid caste systems prevail, social reform by any but the most violent means is practically impossible.[8] On the other hand, societies, like our own, having open-class systems, in which individuals and families pass readily from one status to another, usually are those in which social change is relatively rapid. It may be noted, as well, that rigid caste or class lines tend to retard the spread of innovations from one social level to another; whereas in those with flexible class lines, what is new in one social stratum may soon become the possession of all. It is a general observation that social change occurs most rapidly at higher social levels and that those in lower classes are more conservative regarding most of life's arrangements, although this is not, of course, invariably true.

Change Despite Resistance

With this powerful array of forces and interests opposed to the new, it is well to recall the discussion in Chapter II of the irresistible causes of change. Despite the strong hold of folkways, mores, institutions, and vested interests, social changes must and do take place. They meet less opposition and have behind them stronger motivations in some realms of living than in others, so that they occur unevenly in various phases of group life. The rules of football change more rapidly than does the order of worship of a religious denomination. New forms of credit transactions in business occur more frequently than do new forms of literary expression. Material aspects of culture—the tools and "gadgets" of life—change more readily than nonmaterial phenomena such as beliefs and nonmonetary values. The obvious reason for this is that what is material can usually be demonstrated and its advantages over older methods or devices tangibly measured, whereas the nonmaterial can only be argued.

The Idea of Progress. The idea that human progress is possible, and even inevitable, is of comparatively recent origin and belongs, even now, almost entirely to what is called Western Civilization.[9] The great thinkers of ancient and medieval periods did recognize human change as a part of the record of the past; but they did not extend that change into the

[8] For an excellent study in this field, see John Dollard, *Class and Caste in a Southern Town,* Yale University Press, 1937.

[9] J. D. Bury, *The Idea of Progress,* The Macmillan Co. (London), 1921.

future with the definiteness and certainty that characterizes much of the thinking of our own culture today. It was not until the sixteenth century that, in Europe, the notion of progress was put forth in the forms to which we are quite accustomed today, and it is even more recently that the notion has gained wide acceptance. It is still a difficult idea to reconcile with the detachment characteristic of the social sciences, and it is not self-evident in historical or other facts except when we limit our observation to the strictly material aspects of life. In our culture we combine the idea of progress with teleological theory which supposes that man, collectively, can or does guide his own destiny to a large extent. The influence of these beliefs is powerful and the source of much planned reform which usually lends itself to dramatization. In such dramatization, change and resistance to change are presented as groups of people in conflict, with the high-minded and socially conscious on the one side, aligned against the "reds" or "reactionaries" on the other.

Basic Impersonal Conflict. As previously indicated, there undoubtedly are conflicts in which such dramatization is an approximation to the truth, but societal understanding requires that the far more basic fact be kept in mind—that the opposition between need for change and resistance to change in human affairs is a continuous impersonal struggle among forces which inhere in the very nature of human life. The persons or groups who happen to be involved in particular roles at a given time are of less scientific significance than are the underlying causes of which those persons and groups may be but dimly aware or know nothing. All persons at times desire and seek change, and all, as well, at times oppose change; and from what has been said in this chapter it is safe to assume that all, including the "radicals" and "progressives," are conservative regarding most of life's arrangements even though they demand change in limited areas. It is the task of the social scientist to seek behind the surface and transitory strivings of persons and groups for the deeper impersonal significance of their efforts.

Summary

To the student who shares the high cultural value on what is "progressive," the social significance and value of resistance to change are difficult to comprehend. Societies, institutions, and people are resistant to change, generally speaking, not from malice or caprice, but of necessity. Survival for individuals and groups depends upon the existence of social order, and social order is based upon what is predictable. What is surely predictable, on the other hand, is the repetition of what has

ecurrently happened. All persons, whether they so express themselves or not, have "vested interests" in things going on much as they have in he past. Societies are organized around, and persist in, folkways, mores, nd institutions, recurring sequences of events and relationships. Most f these become accepted by groups as "right" and "natural" and are mbedded in individual habits of conformity. In their totality, these abits, customs, and traditions present powerful obstacles to social change. Yet the need for change is often irresistible, and change does occur, nevenly as among phases of group life, and only in part predictable as o the consequences which may follow. The idea of general progress, man guided, is relatively new even in our own cultural heritage, and as yet acks substance, which can come only with painstaking scientific endeavor o enlarge the area of accurate social prediction.

The conflict between need for change and resistance to change is a ontinuous one which can be adequately understood only as an imperonal struggle between forces which inhere in the nature of human life, nd from it arise social problems.

Terms

Folkways
Mores
Social Order
Vested interests
Social status
Social stratification
Status quo
Role
Conservative

Questions

1. Give an example of mutual support among institutions to resist change.
2. Is the "cake of custom" apparent in college life? Explain.
3. To what extent is driving in traffic based upon the prediction of how individuals and groups will behave?
4. What rights would we have left if social order were destroyed? How could they be preserved?
5. Give an example of the dramatizing of a reform movement.
6. What recent invention might give rise to unforeseen change? Explain.

READING LIST

I. V. Ballard, *Social Institutions.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.
Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture.* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934.
J. D. Bury, *The Idea of Progress.* The Macmillan Co. (London), 1921.
Jerome Dowd, *Control in Human Societies.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1935.
Bertram W. Doyle, *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South.* University of Chicago Press, 1937.
L. T. Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution.* Henry Holt & Co., 1919.
E. C. Hughes, "The Study of Institutions," *Social Forces,* Vol. 20, pp. 315-317, 1944.
Alfred Winslow Jones, *Life, Liberty, and Property.* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1941.
E. M. Lambert, "The Folkways and Social Control," *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 7, pp. 394-399, 1942.
Richard T. LaPiere, *Collective Behavior.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.

Ralph Linton, *The Study of Man.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.
Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.
Robert E. Park, *Social Attitudes.* Henry Holt & Co., 1931.
James S. Plant, *Personality and the Culture Pattern.* The Commonwealth Fund, 1937.
William Graham Sumner, *Folkways.* Ginn & Co., 1906.
Sanford Winston, *Culture and Human Behavior.* Ronald Press, 1933.

CHAPTER IV

Historical Backgrounds

Long before there were social sciences, or even articulate social philosophies, there were human societies, which have been marked from the very beginning by historical continuity. What we find in our human world today, the life ways, social problems, and ideologies, are inseparable from the early beginnings and slow developmental stages which lie in the past. A necessary part of understanding human life is to have in mind an historical perspective which runs back as far as we have any evidences of a distinctive human species of animal.

This chapter is designed to deal very briefly, and therefore sketchily, with man's past. The immediate past which enters most obviously into our present conditions is the period of the Industrial Revolution, which, however, is a phase of an older and broader development, Western Civilization. In turn, Western Civilization is a relatively recent and specialized phase of the whole of social and human evolution.

Human Prehistory

Prehistory deals with the epochs before there were written records. Since there are no records to which to refer our notions of what occurred in that long period, its story must be pieced together from bits of evidence in forms of material remains, such as skeletal fragments, stone and bone implements, remains of early villages; from mythology; and from simple, logical deduction. Whether man, as a distinctive type, has existed on the earth for a million years or for a hundred thousand, no one knows. Quite probably his total history runs well into hundreds of thousands of years, which compares with the five or six thousand for which we have some written records, and the few hundred years that we consider modern history.

Remains of early man have been found widely scattered throughout the world—in China, in South Africa, in Europe, and in England. Most of our logical reconstructions of human life of early prehistoric times have been based upon the evidences found in Europe where the most numerous discoveries of early remains have been found. These deductions seem to fit fairly well, however, with the fragmentary discoveries made elsewhere.

The theoretical sequences of prehistory begin with the paleolithic or old stone age, advance through the neolithic or new stone age, and thence into the age of metals, the reference being in each case to the materials which man used in the making of his tools and weapons. The old stone age was the longest of these periods, and in it man's life was crude and precarious. He lived mostly by hunting, gathering roots, nuts, berries, and other natural foods, and found his shelter in caves or other natural shelters. During the period he showed some inventive and developmental powers, but advancement was slow. The number of people in any area must have been small; and migrations were difficult and over short distances, but frequent.

The neolithic or new stone age was of briefer duration and found man in the possession of many skills. He made better tools and weapons, had a well-developed art, gave evidences of religious practices, built better homes and tombs, and lived in larger and more permanent communities. His life remained, however, both crude and precarious when judged by what is more familiar to us in recent history. In the neolithic period there were beginnings of written language, calendars were devised, and many other of the prerequisites for civilization made their appearance. There appears to have been a considerable overlap between the paleolithic and neolithic periods, with some peoples well advanced in the neolithic while others were still deep in the old stone age of cultural development.

The discovery of metals and their use marked a new stage of human development in various parts of the world. First, the softer metals, such as copper, were hammered into crude instruments and utensils; then came the use of alloys, such as bronze, and later the discovery of iron and the precious metals, such as gold and silver. With all of these came significant changes in man's skills and general ways of living, and the dawn of civilizations. Peoples became more sedentary, cities flourished, written records began, and life became recognizably like our own.

Throughout all of these prehistoric eras—and they covered by far the greater part of man's total existence in the world—men lived in organized groups. These social organizations, although comparatively simple, were the embryonic societies from which our present highly complex societies have come. They included cooperative familial institutions, economic activities, governmental organization, religious and other joint undertakings. Each phase of group life among these primitive peoples represented a cumulative adjustment to living conditions which confronted man, and in each there was a tendency for cultures to become fixed and rigid, even in the face of changing life conditions. Thus, there has ever been present, even in the very earliest periods, the situations which make for social problems—need for change and resistance to

change. Undoubtedly many groups and their cultures perished prehistorically because their ways became so inflexible that they could not adapt to new conditions; and, conversely, others perished because they too readily surrendered their accustomed ways. Certainly in historical times we have seen examples of both.

There are two inclinations to be guarded against in the appraisal of man's early history. One is that of making "savage" synonymous with "evil," and considering everything which was associated with our earliest ancestors as bad. This is purely an enthnocentric type of judgment and is based on very little knowledge of the evidence we have of prehistoric periods. The other is that of thinking nostalgically of the early periods of man's development as an era of freedom from social constraint and the problems of individual and social adjustment which now confront us. The important things to note are that prehistoric man laid the foundations for modern human institutions, but did so so slowly and ploddingly that it is difficult to conceive of the relatively static life he lived. Other things to note are that prehistoric peoples must have had brief lives, carrying on their existences in the face of constant threats of extermination from starvation, wild beasts, inclement weather, and other hazards which we now partly control.

It was prehistoric man who, through countless thousands of years, paved the way for the civilizations which were to come later. In evolutionary terms, there is little evidence that man, individually, either as a physical being or in mental capacity, has changed in the last 25,000 years, since the Cro-Magnon man dwelled in Europe; but the tremendous strides that have been made reflect the increasing efficiency and complexity of group cooperation.

Cultural progress has been, from the beginning, tied closely to man's ability to communicate ideas in language. In man's early existence, undoubtedly language was a crude and limited instrument and served very few and immediate purposes, such as warning of dangers transmitted from one to the other, or expressions of anger and other emotions. Later, as vocabularies increased and words took on more specific meanings, language lent itself to the all-important purpose of making what one person learned in trial-and-error experience available in usable form to other persons, and even from one generation to the next.

As long as language remained unwritten, the amount of learning that could be transmitted from mouth to ear, and from the old to the young, was small; and much had to be learned separately by each individual and each succeeding generation. The rich mythologies developed by preliterate people represent their means of keeping their learning alive through generations.

It was learning to write, late in man's history, comparatively speaking, that greatly expanded the possibilities of accumulating learning and wisdom and gave real impetus to human development. As soon as precise meanings could be committed to written form, it was possible for large numbers to learn from a single individual and for knowledge of one generation to be made available, almost in its entirety, to the next generation.

It is to be noted, however, that development of language, in both preliterate and literate epochs, made possible the spread and perpetuation of error as well as knowledge; and even to our time we have not learned clearly to distinguish one from the other in our culture heritage.

Early Civilizations. The first civilizations made their appearance six to eight thousands years ago, and with their appearance we have the first written records of man's history. They arose in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley in southwestern Asia around the ancient city of Babylon; and in the Nile Valley of Egypt, each to flourish for many centuries, leaving behind fragmentary histories inscribed upon clay tablets and scrolls of papyrus. Many references to these civilizations and especially to their decline are found in the Old Testament of the Bible; and these help to make intelligible their own archives which have been recovered for us in bits by archaeologists.[1]

As these oldest civilizations were declining, others were rising in China and India. Of their earliest developments we know little except from their mythologies, but of their later developments we have quite complete dynastic histories. While these Oriental civilizations flourished, others were developing among the Maya Indians of Central America and in the Andean highlands of South America among the Incas. One American civilization still existed when the early European explorers first "discovered" the Continent—that of the Aztec in the Valley of Mexico.[2]

Close study of the remains and documents of these various early civilizations reveals both the richness and poverty of each. Each was characterized by a complex social structure with people divided into classes and castes; each by the growth of one or a few central cities which were supported largely by a rural or pastoral hinterland or "empire"; each conducted wars of conquest against weaker neighbors; each developed elaborate religious beliefs and rituals; each, to some extent, fostered and promoted learning in a somewhat systematic manner.

---

1 A very reliable, if somewhat romanticized, account of these archaeological findings may be found in R. V. D. Magoffin and Emily C. Davis, *Magic Spades: The Romance of Archaeology*, Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

2 Edgar L. Hewett, *Ancient Life in Mexico and Central America*, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1936; and Hewett, *Ancient Andean Life*, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1939.

Several of these civilizations were gone before the beginnings of Western Civilization became evident, and others disappeared soon after. It is interesting to note that while they were flourishing, the peoples of Europe, who include the ancestors of most present-day Americans, were still primitive tribal peoples of stone-age, or early bronze-age, development, resembling in many ways the nomadic and sedentary Indians, then the only peoples in what is now the United States.

Western Civilization

An offshoot of the early Egyptian civilization took root on the island of Crete in the Mediterranean and became one of the sources of a civilization that later developed in ancient Greece, the first in the direct line of descent of what has come to be called Western Civilization, of which the culture of the United States is a part.

Beginning about three thousand years ago, a group of barbarians who had invaded the Greek peninsula began to build what was to become one of the most brilliant of man's cultural developments. Through centuries there emerged the Greek city states, most important of which was Athens. In these city states there developed art, architecture, literature, philosophy, and the beginnings of science which are still considered a highly significant part of our cultural heritage. The ancient Greek civilization planted the seeds that were to grow into the Roman Empire of the early centuries of the Christian era, and which sheltered the new Christian religious sects, making possible their spread into Europe.

The history of Ancient Greece is probably already somewhat familiar to the student and will be treated here in only the briefest outline. The city states—Athens, Sparta, and others—which were the center of Greek civilization were also the military powers of the time. They failed to bring about effective federation among themselves and fell into frequent inter-city wars, while pressure against them increased from Asia Minor and the eastern Mediterranean. Their culture and influence, as well as their trade, extended by stages to all parts of the Mediterranean world. In the fourth century, B. C., the Macedonian Alexander was able to bring Greece under his control, as well as considerable portions of southwestern Asia. Although the Macedonian Empire lasted for more than a century, the city states of Greece went into a complete eclipse, marking the end of the "glory that was Greece," but only the close of the first of many chapters of expanding Western Civilization.

Greek Civilization dominated the then "known world" of the Greeks for a time, but a glance at the map will show that it was but a small fraction of the inhabited land area. For the student of social problems it

is remarkable that the ancient Greeks, especially in the latter days of their greatness, worried about much the same kinds of social problems that confront us today: narrow nationalism and wars; democracy versus rival schemes of political organization; decline of the family institution; social classes and their antagonisms; forms of education; and the decline of religious influence.[3]

The Roman Empire. Beginning as a remote outpost of Greek Civilization, Rome, at first, appeared to be the least promising of all culture centers. A scattering of settlements on the hills along the Tiber River of Italy, where people of several semibarbaric groups sought safety from pirates of the Mediterranean, it grew into the center of a new civilization in its own right, which was, however, a continuation of the civilization of the Greek city states. In the closing centuries of the pre-Christian Era and extending into the first four centuries of the Christian epoch, Rome made her chief contributions in the arts of government and law, in engineering, and in military organization. She succeeded in bringing the Macedonian Empire under her sway, with the remainder of the "known world" of the Romans, in an empire which extended from India to Spain and from Egypt to Britain. Although not so large as the earlier Indian and Chinese empires, her dominion was by far the largest of those in the line of succession of Western Civilization, and remains of its superb aqueducts and roads are scattered over Western Europe. Mainly, the Roman Empire kept alive and nurtured the civilization that the Greeks had brought to a brief flowering. In the fourth century of the Christian Era the Roman Empire split into an eastern and western half, and Emperor Constantine moved the capital from Rome to Constantinople. This was the end of the greatness of Rome in Western Civilization and marked the beginnings of a new offshoot of the same culture heritage that was eventually to find its center in Moscow.

The decline and fall of the Roman Empire brought an age of confusion when most of the early Greek and Roman culture was lost, and as a result the Islamic peoples of Asia minor and North Africa threatened to engulf Europe. During almost a thousand years of the Dark Ages, Western Civilization was only a spark of learning kept alive in a few scattered monastaries of Europe. With the Renaissance there was a revival of learning and a new and growing respect for the achievements of Ancient Greece and Rome. Western Civilization took on new life in a

[3] To the latter period of ancient Athens belong Plato and Aristotle, whose writings, especially Plato's *Republic*, and Aristotle's *Politics*, are classics for every student of social sciences, serving, as they do, to emphasize the strong intellectual linkage between that early period and our own day.

score of European cities which were developing with a revival of trade and commerce.

An important turning point in Western Civilization came with the ocean voyages of discovery across the Atlantic to America, and around Africa to India and the Orient. The oceans became principal arteries of commerce and trade which grew rapidly and brought to Europe, and especially to England, in time, the surplus of wealth necessary to make possible the Industrial Revolution.

Throughout the Dark Ages the peoples of Eastern and Northern Europe lived barbaric tribal lives; whereas Western Europe saw the rise of the feudal system of social organization. In this system people attached themselves to strong leaders who became overlords. To the overlord they owed their loyalty and obedience, tilling his fields and tending his flocks, or fighting his wars as occasion demanded. The lord, in turn, was obligated to see to the material welfare and protection of his people. The people, as serfs, were attached to the land in a social system not far removed from slavery. The lords, who protected and governed the people, attached themselves by bonds of loyalty and obedience to still stronger leaders, and thus there was the beginning of the early monarchical states of Western Europe.

The Influence of Christianity. One of the great streams which flowed into the larger stream of Western Civilization was Christianity, which had its origin in Asia and its early development in the Roman Empire. With the fall of Rome, Christianity, like the empire, split; and in Western Europe, the Church became, in many ways, the heir of the Roman state. As the Roman Catholic Church, under a long succession of Popes it kept alive the idea of Rome as the center of the world, and, as has been previously noted, it guarded the remnants of Graeco-Roman, or Western Civilization. It added its own spiritual interpretation to that civilization, however, and vied with nobles, princes, and kings for dominion in Western Europe. It was the church that inspired the series of counterattacks by Western Europeans against the rising tide of the East known as the Crusades, beginning in the eleventh century and extending into the thirteenth. The lasting effects of the Crusades were to promote a new unity among the many warring factions of Western Europe, and re-establish fertile contacts with the remnants of Graeco-Roman civilization in Asia.

Also, out of Asia, came the art of printing, which was first devoted in Western Europe to making the Bible more accessible. This, in turn, led to fresh contributions of Christianity to Western Civilization through the Reformation, or the break of numerous sects from the Roman Catholic Church. The idea of freedom of conscience contributed largely to grow

ing individualism and its concomitant notions of personal freedoms.

It was only with the rise of towns and a middle class that feudalism was successfully challenged as a social system, and even then it lingered on in many places, while spreading to Eastern Europe, so that in Europe and elsewhere in the world there are still vestiges of feudal social organizations.

The first of the important cities to develop out of the Dark Ages were those of Italy—Venice, Florence, and other strong trading centers on the Mediterranean. In France and England, notably, there were the beginnings of large-scale political organizations in the form which we recognize as the modern national state. In the meantime Christianity spread to all of Europe and was carried by zealous missionaries to the newly opened parts of the overseas world.

The Industrial Revolution

The vast periods of man's prehistory, the thousands of years of early civilizations which preceded our present Western Civilization, the Dark Ages, and the Renaissance set the stage for the period of modern history and the Industrial Revolution. Since we may well consider that this Revolution is still in progress, this latter period is the one which most immediately concerns us. Although we may find many interesting parallels between our social problems and those of earlier epochs, the forms which these problems take specifically, and the ways in which we regard and attempt to meet them, belong mainly to this present epoch. It has been noted that culture is a continuous historical growth; but, it is a cumulative growth, and, in the case of our own, it has been fed from many streams. These streams have been dealt with only suggestively, and not exhaustively, in the first part of this chapter.

It is impossible to assign beginning dates to the Industrial Revolution, so complex a series of developments being involved, and the Revolution itself merging so indistinguishably with its precursors. Usually the term "Industrial Revolution" is confined to changes of the last century and a half, or less; and to keep our perspective in mind it is necessary to compare that period with the three thousand years since the beginnings of Western Civilization in Greece, the six thousand years since the dawn of the earliest civilizations, and the hundreds of thousands of years of man's total written and unwritten history.

All through this time, very slowly at first, and later by accelerated speed, man was learning the division of labor in productive work and the use of machines to do more and more of his work. These were the great factors which combined eventually to usher in this latest and (for us) most important period. Looking back, some of the stages of the long prerequisite developments may be distinguished.

Background. Economic activities of various groups have developed through a number of more or less clearly defined stages, even though some peoples have had somewhat exceptional histories in this regard. The earliest and crudest economy is that of simply gathering the fruits, nuts, roots, and other provision supplied by nature in an immediate environment. Peoples who so live must constantly move from place to place because the supply to be found in any one locality is soon exhausted. They can live only in areas where nature is bountiful.

In favorable locations, and also at early stages of development, small bands of people develop hunting or fishing economies. Under the former they are usually under the necessity of following their game from place to place seasonally, as was the practice of many of the hunting Indian tribes of America who followed the buffalo from grazing area to grazing area on the Great Plains. Peoples who live by fishing, if strategically located, are able to be much more sedentary in their abodes and some of the earliest communities were built on the shores of lakes or ocean inlets.

As a later economic development most peoples who survived learned probably more or less by accident, to plant seeds and cultivate the soil in crude ways. This meant a somewhat surer food supply and tended to keep them in or near the place they were tilling, at least for the time necessary for the seeds to mature into food crops. As a still later development, some peoples learned to domesticate a few animals to be used for hunting, doing work of various kinds, and to be eaten for meat. In this pastoral stage of development, very often combined with some crude agriculture, peoples had to move as pasturage became exhausted; and the pastoral peoples have usually been nomadic or seminomadic in their ways of living.

Further improvements in agriculture and raising of animals made possible the development of fixed villages and towns, which could grow to considerable size because of the larger and surer supply of food. With towns came diversity of economic activity, specialization, and trade. Commerce arose among and between towns, and the stage was set for what is called the Industrial Revolution.

Even though the stage was set for industrial development, for most peoples of the world this further development has come slowly, and only a few exceptionally well located as to resources and trade channels have become highly industrialized. Most peoples have remained chiefly agricultural in their dependence, and a large part of the earth's population is still in a subsistence stage of that art.

Although the United States is now among the most highly industrialized of countries, a century and a half ago it was almost entirely agricultural, and it required the productive labor of twenty farmers

support themselves, their families, and one city dweller. Changes have been sweeping since that time; and it is now estimated that one farmer can produce enough to feed himself, his family, and twenty city dwellers. Nevertheless, even in the United States, there are large regions that are predominantly agricultural and millions of persons who live near the subsistence level of farming.

The Agricultural Revolution. The immediate forerunner of the Industrial Revolution was necessarily an agricultural revolution, or a rapid increase in farming efficiency which released considerable numbers of workers from farms and made them available as labor in towns and cities. Since in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution manufacturing was almost entirely by hand, such a labor pool, made up of surplus of workers from farms, and so greatly in need that they would work cheaply, had to exist to give the early impetus to industrial production.

Equally necessary as a precursor of the Industrial Revolution was the concentration in a relative few hands of surplus wealth which might be risked in financing production before returns from the enterprise could be had. Manufacturing is unlike farming in that usually the enterpriser cannot eat what he produces if he cannot sell it, so that he must enter into an involved and delayed process that requires capital investment.

The Process in England

Although it is impossible to assign definite dates to such an involved process as the Industrial Revolution, it can be seen clearly that the process began first, and reached its furthest development quite recently, in England. At the dawn of English history the primitive peoples who lived on the islands now constituting the United Kingdom were in a very low stage of economic development, but they did carry on agriculture, herd flocks, manufacture, and trade. With Romanization, fixed towns developed and trade and commerce increased, as did the variety of skills which went into various kinds of hand manufacturing. However, the English people remained primarily agricultural and pastoral until two hundred years ago.

In England the agricultural revolution freed large numbers from farming and pastoral activities and these people came into cities, principally London, in great numbers, where they were the labor needed for great increase in manufacturing. At the same time overseas trade brought to England the necessary surplus wealth for financing industrial production and provided a large market abroad for manufactured goods.

During the early stage of the Industrial Revolution in England, manufacturing was chiefly a home industry, carried on by families of the poor-

est economic classes, usually in distressing conditions which made them desperate for the small earnings that could be thus gained. The enterpriser would purchase and supply raw materials to such families, and often he would give them the tools needed for turning the raw materials into finished products for the market. The same enterpriser would then undertake to sell the finished goods at a profit to himself and those who had helped finance his enterprise, if groups were concerned, as they often were.

This was about the stage of development of the Industrial Revolution in England that the Pilgrims left to establish colonies in North America. It produced a wage system and skilled artisans who helped pave the way for the next stage that came with the replacement of home industry by the factory system. The harnessing of steam power to drive machines made the factory economically possible and necessary. The machines had to be concentrated near the source of the power, since steam soon loses its efficiency if transported over considerable distances.

Power production, starting in the textile industry, spread and developed rapidly. Steam applied to transportation made it possible to bring fuel and raw materials from considerable distances cheaply; and thus factories developed in many places, and cities grew up around them. The market for English-made goods extended to all parts of the world, and the very concentrations of laborers in the cities created lucrative markets at the factory doors.

Numerous developments accompanied the Industrial Revolution in England, and later elsewhere, which have shaped much of modern life in industrial nations. One was the rise to power of the middle class, who were the enterprisers of industry and the foundation of a large industrial working class. With the rise of the middle class came the democratic institutions of government in England, Western Europe, and America. Urbanization increased, and cities displaced the rural village as the principal scene of modern living in industrial countries. The growth of commerce abroad led to modern imperialism.

Change in life conditions had always been a fact of human group life, but the rate of change was vastly increased with the Industrial Revolution and has been increasing at an accelerated pace ever since. Paradoxically, the same period brought into being new vested interests, vitally interested in maintaining the *status quo* in large areas of life activities; indeed *laissez faire* and maintenance of the *status quo* became by-words of the leaders of industrialization and large-scale commercial development. Thus, the ever-present conflict between forces making for change and those resisting change has become intensified.

Although the Industrial Revolution brought rapid rise in the general level of living for industrial countries, the rise was not shared by all

groups in the population, and increasingly the developing cities presented contrasts of great wealth and miserable poverty side by side. The growth of cities brought a decline in the effectiveness of primary intimate relationships among people, with the breakdown of traditional social controls, so that more and more formal law and legal procedures were necessary to bring about conformity of individuals with group requirements and standards.

The Industrial Revolution Elsewhere

The Industrial Revolution spread from England to several of the countries of continental Europe, notably the low countries, France and Germany. It also spread to the United States where it had, at first, a slow development while the people of this country were occupied chiefly with the conquest of the vast land frontier to the west. In each successive country to be swept by the Industrial Revolution, because many of the developments had already been made in other industrial countries, the process was shorter. In Japan it required only a few generations, whereas in England it had taken as many centuries. Among the latest of the large countries to undergo the process has been the Soviet Union, where it has been forced in a single generation.

At present a large part of the world is in one stage or another of the Industrial Revolution, whereas England, and other of the countries which pioneered the development, appear to have reached a stage of maturity, and the United States has taken the lead in technological development. The development of new sources of power, such as electricity, have widened possibilities of industrial development. The present efforts to harness atomic power gives even more promise of great productive enterprises in the future.

Other Recent Developments

Although the period of recent history has been treated under the heading of the Industrial Revolution, industrialization—with its extreme division of labor, increasing use of mechanical force, and urbanization—has been one of many of the great developments of about the same few centuries. Others have included the growth and intensification of nationalism; the spread of democracy and counter non-democratic movements; the rise and, currently, decline of empires; the virtual disappearance of human slavery; the emancipation of women; the spread of education; and the progressive and continuous development of science. The history of the era might be written with emphasis upon any or several of these developments, but probably that which has most contributed to all the

others, and has been the most direct cause of modern social problems, is the Industrial Revolution.

Summary

The history of man is long, and societal history is, probably, even longer; but the history of what we may call our own times is by comparison exceedingly brief. Yet, most pertinent to our immediate social problems and their understanding is this last brief epoch which coincides with the Industrial Revolution.

If we think of the first long span of human life as all that time preceding the beginnings of Western Civilization, it may be considered as one in which life for individuals and groups was relatively precarious and mean by comparison with modern standards. Change came so slowly that it must have been hardly discernible at most times; yet change there was, and, from what we can conjecture, it met with social resistance.

The first long period culminated in a brief few thousand years in which the earliest civilizations came into being, flourished for some centuries, then declined. Upon a few remnants of one of these, the Egyptian, was built the Ancient Greek civilization which is usually considered as the starting point of Western Civilization. This latter great movement has had its periods of varying activity and decline, but survives and thrives today, with our own culture in the United States a part of it.

The Industrial Revolution is a recent and specialized phase of Western Civilization which began a few centuries ago in England and has since spread to all parts of the world. We may consider that the Industrial Revolution is still in progress, with some countries and peoples further advanced than others, but nearly all peoples of the world at least embarked upon the venture.

In the Industrial Revolution we may find explanation of the specific forms which our present social problems assume, as well as the explanation of our modes of thinking about them and of attempting to meet them.

Terms

Paleolithic
Neolithic
Civilization
Sedentary
Nomadic
Cro-Magnon Man
Mythology
Archives
Dynastic
City state
Feudalism
Reformation
Factory System

Questions

1. In what ways did prehistoric eras pave the way for the rise of civilizations?
2. Which were the earliest human civilizations to emerge? What were some of their characteristics?

3. In what respects did the early Greek civilization, especially its decline, show rough resemblance to our own?

4. What were outstanding contributions of Roman civilization to the general current of Western Civilization?

5. Why was an agricultural revolution necessary before there could be an Industrial Revolution?

6. What other important developments have come during the period of the Industrial Revolution?

READING LIST

J. H. Clapham and E. Powers, *The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages.* The Macmillan Co., 1941.

J. A. Hobson, *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism.* London, 1926.

W. W. Howells, *Mankind So Far.* Doubleday & Co., 1944.

L. C. A. Knowles, *The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain in the Nineteenth Century.* London, 1926.

G. C. MacCurdy, *Early Man.* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1937.

R. C. D. Magoffin and Emily C. Davis, *Magic Spades: The Romance of Archaeology.* Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

Henry F. Osborne, *Man of the Old Stone Age.* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

W. M. F. Petrie, *The Revolutions of Civilizations.* Harper & Bros., 1912.

Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial.* Oxford University Press, 1948.

PART II

Social Problems

CHAPTER V

The Problem of War

There is general agreement among social scientists that modern wars constitute one of the most critical and immediate problems of human relations. Some go so far as to say that another major conflict would bring an end to civilization and, perhaps, to mankind. For the student of social sciences an analysis of the problem of war and numerous closely related problems is a promising starting point because it can reveal much that is pertinent to other social problems, and to the nature of all organized group life. War is an experience of all societies, with very few exceptions. Wars recur frequently, one authority estimating that there have been 967 international wars, and more than 1,600 revolutions and civil wars in the last 2,400 years.[1] It is difficult to find any period in history when war was not in progress somewhere in the world, and even a professedly peace-loving nation like the United States has been at war throughout more than half her history if conflicts with Indians are taken into consideraiton.

Many aspects of the problem of war are quite obvious. It is destructive of life and property and disruptive of established social order. It involves nations in large and burdensome expenses and heavy tax loads both during time of war and in the constant necessity of being prepared for war. It constitutes a threat to the welfare, even the existence, of groups; and causes widespread misery and maladjustment to a great many individuals. These latter considerations bring it within the definition of social problems as given in the first chapter.

In addition, but not so obvious, is the relation of war to all other social problems. Its aftermath is disturbance of economic balance through inflation, heavy taxation, and interruption of normal world trade. It brings famine and disease, disablement and mental disturbances, poverty and disillusionment, and many other consequences, both as immediate and long-term results. It is highly significant that war tends to intensify hatreds and distrust among groups and to magnify nationalism, so that every war, to some extent, prepares the ground for new wars.

[1] For these and other estimates of the number, duration, and magnitude of wars, see P. A. Sorokin, *Society, Culture, and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics*, Harper & Bros., 1947, pp. 496 ff.

War and Need for Change

Warfare appears to be as old as human society, but it has gone through many successive changes. Both the intensity and extent of wars have varied widely through history. In many eras, institutionalized warfare has been a regular and normal part of social organization and process, and as such could hardly have been considered a social problem, or if a problem, a very serious one. During the pre-Napoleonic era of European history, wars were frequent but limited in their scope and effects. They were professionalized activities, removed from ordinary peaceful activities, for the most part, and could be considered as adjuncts of ordinary political and economic activity. When Napoleon introduced universal conscription to Europe to raise his great armies, there was a decided turning point which led, step by step, to what we now know as total war. Total war enlists and mobilizes whole populations and tends to erase the previous line between combatant and noncombatant, so that the whole of society is drawn into major war efforts.

Conscription is one of several significant accompaniments of warfare to come in recent times. Another has been increasing mechanization and depersonalization of warfare. These have made of war as much a struggle between the industrial potentials of nations as it is a combat between armed forces, and it tends to make the destruction of each other's industrial plants a primary objective of opposing forces. This shift has led to necessary huge expenditures of natural resources, on scales which baffle the imagination and which threaten to exhaust world supplies of many of these resources. The size of forces engaged in carrying on wars and the numbers of casualties run into figures so large as to have little meaning except as a kind of bookkeeping. The development of new and far more destructive and deadly weapons make escape and security impossible for anyone, whether combatant or civilian.

These and other recent changes in the character and scope of warfare have impressed upon people everywhere the need for social change which will remove both the actuality and threat of major wars. What must be at least a part of this change is obvious and generally agreed upon by students of the problem. It must be a sweeping reorganization of the international political structure. Many would go even further in describing the need and say that no changes in political structure will abolish wars unless they are accompanied by some form of re-education of the peoples of the world. Certainly of the whole complex of causes of wars as we know them today, two are outstanding. One is the existence of the sovereign nation-state, free to act as it will without effective outside control. The other is the long, deeply rooted, and well-nigh universal tradi-

tions which glorify war and exalt death in battle. The need for vast social change is inescapable to those who seriously study modern warfare.

Resistance to Change. The kind of changes which seem needed in social organization have long been recognized, and numerous programs aimed at eliminating war have been undertaken. Twice in recent times, after the First World War and again after the Second World War, steps have been taken toward the creation of a world political organization resembling the more limited and numerous national states in form, but superimposed upon them. The national state, although a warlike organization in the international arena, has been a highly successful means of maintaining comparative order and peace within its own boundaries. Therefore, it seems to many that a similar form of organization on a world basis could be equally successful in maintaining order and peace throughout the world. But all programs aimed at an adequate change to guarantee peace have met with strong opposition and resistance.

The resistance to a world political order comes chiefly at the point where the national state is faced with the question of surrendering, wholly or in part, its sovereignty, or the right to be the final judge and arbiter of its own policies and actions. Such a surrender, once made, would be, in effect, irrevocable except by resort to force and warfare. The consequences of the surrender by any state of its sovereignty would be largely unforeseeable. Peoples of all nations have so long been educated to the view that their own nation is the best nation, its own ways the best ways, that any change would, of necessity, be to something presumably less desirable; so, despite the insistent necessity for change presented by the probability of future and more destructive wars, nations quite generally resist the surrender of any but the least significant portions of their sovereignty.

In connection with programs which would re-educate peoples for peace, there, again, is a critical point at which peoples quite universally resist change. Such re-education would necessarily have to be aimed against patriotism and other related values which prepare people for the recurrent sacrifices of war. When the test comes, it is soon apparent that many of the highest values—in a nonmonetary sense—are those which are attached to the glorification of wars and heroic deeds in battle, and effective re-education to abolish wars would mean the elimination of many basic elements in the ideals by which peoples live, with nothing that is dependably predictable to put in their place.

Vested Interests and War. In view of the nature of modern warfare, all nations and individuals have vested interests in peace and the assurance of continued peace. War, itself, upsets schedules and plans, destroys

values, and increases burdens in ways that can be foreseen only in very general ways. It tends to curtail, and may even destroy, traditional rights. Yet, except in cases of complete collapse of a nation, war does not destroy, but in many ways enhances, social order. A nation-state mobilized for war is orderly and, although old schedules and expectations are upset, new and more dependable *routines* of living quickly arise. Once a society becomes reorganized for war, the vested interests of most individuals become attached to the war order, so that the cessation of war and reconstruction may, in turn, become disruptive.

Many persons, even in peacetime, have vested interests in war and the threat of wars at the same time that the same persons have a vested interest in peace. This would obviously be true of professional warriors, whose whole training fits them for, and whose advancement depends upon, war. Many such, even though they know their very lives are at stake, exult at the coming of "action" which represents the fruition of all their life training and planning.[2] The makers of war munitions and most large industrialists have a vested interest in wars and threats of war, even though they also have vested interests in the conditions of lasting peace. Since war, on the modern scale, means manpower shortage, the unemployed and under-employed stand to gain by wartime opportunities. The vast number who feel frustrated and defeated in developing peacetime plans may welcome the new opportunities that wars bring them, temporarily, whether it be the young woman who has been unable to make a favorable marriage, or the failure in business who may now become an imposing bureaucrat. Politicians who find domestic political problems difficult have in war a force that reunites people and submerges issues in the one effort to win. Such vested interests tend to make war, with all its uncertainties, an acceptable gamble for many millions of individuals.

The Study of War

The problems posed by modern warfare have led to much study by social scientists and even more theorizing in disregard of facts. The studies have, for the most part, been carried on from limited viewpoints; and the results have been, mostly, particularistic analyses. Much of what is most basic to the understanding of war is of concern to social psychology, newest and least mature of the social sciences. Certainly, from what valid findings we have, it becomes apparent that no matter how immediate may be the demand for solutions of problems of war and related problems, we must patiently seek more understanding before such solutions

[2] This exultation in "action" is reflected in many of the memoirs of fighting men following the Second World War, notably in parts of *Admiral Halsey's Story*, by Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey and Lieut. Commander J. Bryan III, Whittlesey House, 1947.

can be had. What understanding we have so far presents little more than a discouraging array of paradoxes, as the discussion thus far may illustrate.

Political Science and War. Running through the discussion of war in writings of political scientists of this country and England are several fictions which must be examined critically in order to determine what may be accepted as valid. Among the most widespread is that the nation-states of the world may be neatly divided into warlike, or aggressor nations, and peace-loving nations. A companion fiction is that dictatorial and totalitarian states promote wars, whereas democracies shun war. Historical facts do not bear out either assumption, whether we study ancient or modern history. All nation-states, whose positions permit, appear to engage in frequent wars, and no valid correlation appears to exist between the frequency or extent of war and form of government.[3]

The whole issue of aggressor nations is so confused by lack of agreement on just what constitutes an act of aggression, what are deliberate preparations for waging war, and which are preparations for defense against possible attacks, that analysis along this line can only be national self-pleading, which is not science. Certainly, in recent wars all participants and both sides were free in charging their enemies with aggressive intent and in dignifying their own efforts as a fight for survival.

Some of the politically significant facts about war need careful consideration. The modern nation-state, and its counterpart, the modern political empire, are products of warfare which united the earlier and lesser political units of the feudal era into the larger and more populous units of the present nation. Spain, France, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, especially exemplify the role of warfare in creating the modern state. Wars with other nations have consolidated modern nations into functioning units welded together by strong nationalistic sentiments.

The national state is fundamentally two-purposed: a machine for maintaining peace and order among large numbers of peoples and organizations within its boundaries, and an organization for conducting war with other nations. For both purposes it is the most efficient organization yet devised in the history of man. The nation-state, as a form of organization, has, since its mature development, remained comparatively static. The number of nations and extent of their territories have not changed greatly in the last century. During that period economic, scientific, and technological organization has become largely international and world-wide, but effective political organization has remained confined to limited segments of humanity within rigidly defined national boundaries. The trend has been toward increasing nationalism within na-

3 Sorokin, *op. cit.*, p. 498.

tion-states, politically, even while others of man's organized activities have tended to become ever more extensive and inclusive.

The relative lack of effective political organization outside the nation-state does not mean, however, that there has been or is complete anarchy in international political affairs. There have been, historically, a series of arrangements which have maintained a degree of regulation as between and among different nations. In recent times these developments have been chiefly efforts to duplicate in the international field various political institutions which had previously evolved in national governments. Perhaps the oldest of these is international law composed of treaties, codes, and precedents which set up rules for behavior in relations among nations. A large part of international law relates to the conduct of war, defining noncombatants, rules for treatment of prisoners of war, etc. Although often violated under the stress of warfare, these rules nevertheless are usually followed in large measure due to fear of reprisals if they are violated. International courts and tribunals, temporary and semipermanent, have existed for a considerable time as a recognized part of international order. Recent significant examples have been the international tribunals to try leaders of defeated nations on various charges of war guilt and an effort to establish, by setting a precedent, the plotting and waging of aggressive war as a crime against humanity.

The League of Nations, formed after the First World War, and the United Nations, growing out of the Second World War, have been efforts to introduce continuous parliamentary government in the international field. To this there is added, by the United Nations, a design for an international police force. The controversial "veto" in the Security Council and the rigid limitations on powers of the General Assembly mark clearly the line where need for extension of international government meets the full force of resistance to further change as it significantly challenges old ideas of national sovereignty.

War is a clearly recognized political policy in international relations, but it is also a matter of domestic policy within national politics. Going to war may serve the purpose, whether primary or incidental, of uniting the people of a nation behind the existing regime and of postponing irksome domestic issues "for the duration." It has certain highly predictable effects on national governments. The shift from peace to the state of war almost invariably increases and concentrates governmental power. It leads to rapid increase in the number and scope of governmental functions and the partial or complete curtailment of traditional rights. This is accompanied by rapid expansion of bureaucracy, rise in taxes, and increased invasion of the economy by government as a buyer and producer of goods. In the periods immediately following wars there

is sharp and strong reaction against such governmental trends, even to the extent, at times, of overthrowing or changing the form of government.

Other incidental consequences of wars as they affect domestic politics are the blaming of the parties in power during wars for the frustrations and dislocations due to war, with a reversal in partisan trends; the tendency to exalt military heroes to places of leadership in party and government; and the intensifications of problems arising from conflicting interest which maintained truces during the war.

Economics and War. From the standpoint of economics, a self-sufficient national economy, in which a nation would have within its borders all the natural resources and industrial productive capacity both to support its normal activities and a costly mechanized war is a necessary goal under existing conditions. Such self-sufficient economies, if they existed, would be disastrous to world trade because countries would have no needs for imports. There is no modern nation that has achieved, or even closely approximated, self-sufficiency in this sense; yet, because of fear of war, all strive to achieve it as far as they can without assuming an unbearable load of subsidies for nonprofitable industries. At the same time, all countries seek export markets for their surpluses; and what, in economic logic, would be a natural evolution toward a complete world economy that would raise general living standards for all is constantly involved in the basic contradiction because of nationalistic policies. The long-term trends of world economic relations have been ambivalent—increasing interdependence among peoples, regardless of national boundaries, and increasing volume of international trade, on the one hand; on the other, a growth in legal restrictions on the free flow of goods among nations, and the increasing frequency and violence of interruption of international trade due to the changing character of war. Despite the latter forces, the world has moved ever closer to a world economy and is under ever greater compulsion to move further in that direction. This raises the question, as yet unanswerable: How long can we move toward the seemingly opposed goals of greater political nationalism and an ever-extending economic internationalism?

One of the popular over-simplifications of the economics of war is that which points out that all nations, victors and vanquished alike, lose in modern wars. True, the costs of war, whether measured in monetary units or in goods and labor, are ever-increasing and have reached astronomical sums. Equally true it is that, following exhaustive total warfare, victor nations can expect little in tribute from defeated foes. Territories which are annexed are more apt to be liabilities than assets. Still, the economic effects on national economies are various and cannot adequately be summed up in so simple a statement. For nations which have been

invaded and which have been defeated there may be almost complete collapse of productive machinery, with unemployment, privation, and an almost total lack of money or credit. Yet even such prostrated nations show remarkable recuperative powers, as did Germany and the countries of the Danube basin following the First World War.

By contrast, it must be noted that the economy of the United States, previous to the hectic preparations for, and eventual entry into, war, was still in the precarious condition following the depression of the early 1930's. During the war, while the government accumulated great debts, industrial firms and individuals prospered, unemployment virtually disappeared, living standards generally rose, and savings climbed to new historical high marks. Following both the First and Second World Wars, the immediate aftermath was prosperity felt throughout the entire population of this country. It may be that the depression of 1921 and the worse one of the early 1930's were results of war, but, as we shall note in a later chapter, the causation of business cycles is so complex that any answer must be inconclusive. War, with its consumption of material wealth, has served to bring into high relief the tremendous increase in the productive potentials of industrial nations. The large-scale destruction of wealth creates demand and markets for new production; and the elimination by destruction or deterioration of obsolete or near-obsolete productive plants clears the ground for more efficient and economical plants to replace them. Deprived by war of imports, nonindustrial countries are forced into industrial production, usually with favorable effects upon their general living standards. Thus, it may be that modern wars, despite appearances to the contrary, in the long run make for greater productivity and wealth rather than for less. We do not yet have sufficient knowledge or understanding to judge.

Certainly war and preparation for war bulk large in public finance of all nation-states. Current military expenditures in addition to the servicing of debts from past wars and the meeting of obligations to war veterans and their survivors constitute the largest public expenditure and a great share of the national tax burden. Even this fact, however, may be misleading unless examined in the total framework of the relation of public finance to the general economy, for the money which governments spend for these purposes goes into circulation and creates or expands markets for goods, or accumulates in savings and capital investments. In this way, although tax burdens have increased greatly following wars, the ability to meet such taxes has also mounted.

For individuals, the economic effects of war are felt in two ways: either a general rise or fall in the standard of living which varies with effects on the national economy, and in partial redistribution of wealth and income through the population. In the latter regard, in some cases it may

have a leveling effect and reduce disparities in income and wealth. In others it may have the opposite effect of greatly increasing them.

Sociology and War. The sociologist William Graham Sumner, previously mentioned in connection with the concepts of folkways and mores, also developed those of the "in-group" and "out-group," from his comparative studies of social organization.[4] All mature human beings are attached by bonds of loyalty to groups with which they identify themselves (in-groups) and look with suspicion or even hostility upon other groups which in some way compete with or threaten the in-group (out-groups). In the ethical and moral codes and practices of peoples there is one set of rules to govern relationships to other members of the in-group, and quite another to govern relations with members of the out-groups. The unity and solidarity of the in-group are largely determined by the degree of fear and hostility toward out-groups. The operation of in-group and out-group sentiments can be seen demonstrated at any college football rally, where the student body is welded into an hysterically loyal unit by the threat symbolized in the team of an opposing college.

The sociologist emphasizes warfare as the extreme logical extension of latent in-group and out-group feelings attached to the national state in which the stronger the ties of loyalty to one's own state and its other citizens, the greater the hostility toward other national states and their citizens. Of course, in wartime these twin phenomena are obvious in their extreme expression, when moral values make it imperative to cooperate with and sacrifice for one's fellow in-group members, and equally mandatory to hate and, if possible, destroy, members of the out-groups which are singled out for enemies.

Each citizen has many in-group attachments—the family, business firm, recreational club, community, etc.—but the national state makes it morally imperative that in time of crises all other loyalty attachments be subordinated to that which binds the citizen to his nation.

Sociologists have long been concerned with the effect of war on peacetime group-life routines and institutions. War tends to affect familial institutions by increasing, then decreasing, if the war endures, the marital, birth, and divorce rates. It tends to loosen familial ties by separating married couples and depriving children of normal parental care. An aftermath of war is a tendency for all delayed processes reflected in the marriage, birth, and divorce rates to catch up with prewar levels.[5] War tends to reduce crime rates because those in age-groups most apt to commit crimes are mobilized into the armed forces; but it increases

[4] *Folkways*, Ginn & Co., 1907, p. 12.

[5] Willard Waller, *War and the Family*, The Dryden Press, 1940. (An addendum to *The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation.*)

juvenile delinquency, and thereby future crime rates, by depriving chil dren of parental care and confronting them with unusual frustrations Especially is the delinquency rate among girls increased by a genera relaxation of standards of sex morality.

Recently, and especially during and following the Second World War sociologists have given considerable attention to the social organizatio and processes of the armed forces. Armies, navies, and other branche are highly institutionalized, having, in addition to their formal regula tions a host of informal, but rigidly enforced, folkways. Side by sid with the status-rank system described in formal regulations there exist an informal, but effective scheme of ranks and status.[6] Like all institu tional clusters those of the armed forces, basically, are resistant to change so that there is always a lag between strategy, tactics, and unit organiza tion on one hand, and the demands created by new techniques of war fare on the other.

Social Psychology and War. The social psychologist sees in war the sam complex array of problems and techniques of personality adjustment tha are found in peacetime, but usually intensified. For some individual this intensification is extreme. Those who are socially maladjusted befor the outbreak of war are most apt to be maladjusted in war; and thos who adjust easily and readily tend to take the changes brought by wa in their stride. Few persons are ever fully adjusted in their personal an group relationships, so that most people at any time have some adjus ment problems. War brings escape from many such problems, at leas postponing them, so that it brings a feeling of relief and exultation. A the same time, war, by interrupting life routines, constitutes a threa to existing satisfactory adjustments and thus brings feelings of anxiet To all persons, then, in widely varying proportions, war brings bot exultation and anxieties and, where anxieties predominate, a high inc dence of psychoneurotic disorders. Once the adjustment to war routine has been made, the prospect of the return of peacetime routines has th same general effect which is especially pronounced in those released fro the armed forces who must, of course, make the most far-reachin readjustments.

History of War. Much that has already been said in this chapter i derived from the history of wars. Historians have, except in writing c the distant past, chiefly studied wars from the viewpoints of their ow and closely allied nations whose records are most readily accessibl Their preoccupation has been with the unique circumstances and even

[6] *The American Journal of Sociology* devoted an entire issue (Vol. LI, No. 5 March, 1946) to discussion of the sociology of the armed forces.

in the battles, campaigns, and careers of heroes of particular wars. The historian, because his works are more widely read by the general public, is under greater pressure than other students of war to give support to the popular romantic myths about war.

Anthropology and War. From the anthropologists we have mainly the study of the techniques and practices of warfare among primitive peoples, and confirmation of the universality of in-group out-group sentiments in social organization and processes. The popular assumption that the "savagery" of war is a survival of the brutality of our early "cave dwelling" ancestors is conclusively contradicted by factual observation. The few peoples who do not engage in frequent warfare are among the most primitive. The practice of warfare among other primitives is, apparently, a mild and half-hearted affair, having as much the characteristics of an organized sport event as those of war as we know war. The more deadly and destructive modes of warfare are learned from "civilized" peoples. The more advanced the civilization of a group, the more cruel its practices in warfare are apt to be. War, as we know it, is definitely a part of modern civilization and seems to keep pace in its development with other aspects of civilization.

Unanswered Questions. From this brief summary of some of the findings of social scientists in their studies of war, several things are significant. One is that there is a large and growing mass of factual data and interpretation, much of which, to be sure, is irrelevant to the principal issues. The other is that the data, coming from the limited points of view of the various social sciences, do not readily integrate into a meaningful whole. It leaves us with no certain answer to the basic question: Can war be eliminated from inter-group relations? Or, can it be brought under rational controls to better suit the requirements of our general welfare? The answers lie deeper in the understanding of man's group processes and the human nature which grows out of his organized group relationships than we have yet penetrated. The frontiers of our understanding of the problem of war have advanced notably in recent generations, but they must move further before the social sciences will be prepared with certain answers.

Summary

The problem of war is one of increasing destruction of lives and wealth, and interruption of peacetime social routines. It has taken new form with the advent of total war and mechanization, calling for radical changes in social organization to bring it under more rational control. At the point where such changes threaten national sovereignty and the

destruction of a multitude of values that support war, change meets with strong, even overwhelming, resistance, and thus the problem of warfare illustrates our basic formula for social problems.

This chapter has been designed to further acquaint the students with the differing emphasis underlying the various social sciences as they investigate a single social problem area. It shows that there is room and need for these specialized approaches, but when the various factual findings are assembled they do not readily integrate into a coherent whole. Finally, the chapter shows the complexity of a social problem and the need for further understanding before the social sciences can offer ready and sure answers to fundamental questions.

Terms

Correlation
Depersonalization
In-group
International law
Nationalistic
National state
Out-group
Parliamentary
Particularistic
Regime
Sovereignty
Tribunal

Questions

1. What obvious changes are needed to eliminate or curb international wars?
2. How does war illustrate the formula previously given to account for social problems?
3. How can you account for wide-spread vested interests in peace? In war?
4. Under what conditions may the waging of international war be a matter of domestic policy?
5. What is the emphasis in sociological analysis of war?
6. How is "international law" formed?

READING LIST

L. L. Bernard, *War and Its Causes.* Henry Holt & Co., 1944.
Thomas Brockaway, *Battles Without Bullets: The Story of Economic Warfare.* The Foreign Policy Association, 1939.
F. J. Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph L. Roucek, et al., *Contemporary World Politics.* John Wiley & Sons, 1940.
Vivian Fry, *The Peace that Failed: How Europe Sowed the Seeds of War.* The Foreign Policy Association, 1939.
Vivian Fry, *Bricks Without Mortar: The Story of International Cooperation.* The Foreign Policy Association, 1938.
A. L. Lowell, *Public Opinion in War and Peace.* Harvard University Press, 1916.
R. M. MacIver, *The Web of Government.* The Macmillan Co., 1947, Chapter 12.
Mark A. May, *The Social Psychology of War and Peace.* Yale University Press, 1943.
P. A. Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics.* The American Book Co., 1937, Vol. III.
P. A. Sorokin, *Society, Culture, and Personality.* Harper & Bros., 1947, Chapters 32 and 33.
Alfred Vagts, *A History of Militarism,* W. W. Norton & Co., 1937.
Paul Walter, Jr., "Education for War and Peace," in Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, *Sociological Foundations of Education.* Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1942.
Arnold Wolfers, *Britain and France Between Two Wars.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1940.
Quincy Wright, *A Study of War.* University of Chicago Press, 1942.

CHAPTER VI

Poverty

Poverty, like war, is a part of the experience of all peoples and has persisted as a problem throughout human history. Unlike war, poverty is not a periodically recurring condition, but rather it is ever-present in group life even though its form and significance may change. So consistent has it been in human experience that much of social order is based upon the expectation of continued poverty. Our own Social Security laws, the growing profession of social service, charitable societies, funds and foundations of various kinds, and numerous asylums for the poor are a few of the tangible evidences; and much of religious belief and ethical systems as well as practical economic and political guides to action presuppose poverty as a permanent phase of group life. In this connection it is interesting to note that the existence of poverty has been explained seriously, at times, as necessary to provide the virtuous with means for displaying their charitable natures. Poverty is obviously devastating in its effect upon countless millions of individuals in all generations, and it is a threat to the welfare of many groups.

Presumably, with sufficient changes in methods of distribution of the products of the world's enormous productive potential, poverty, in its worst forms, could be eliminated within a relatively short time. Such changes, however, would go contrary to many institutional ideals in many cultures, would destroy an enormous array of vested interests—as this term was defined in Chapter III—and would so alter accustomed life routines as to bring many unforeseeable consequences. Thus poverty illustrates the basic formula presented in Chapter I—an obvious need for change meeting strong resistance, with the resultant societal strains.

The World Setting. A useful starting point in the analysis of complex phenomena is classification; and a crude scheme which begins to reveal some pertinent facts about poverty would present several categories. Poverty may be absolute, the lack of access to sufficient of the world's goods and services to maintain life and a minimum of health for social functioning; or it may be relative, permitting satisfaction of life's basic needs, but nevertheless attaching to persons the social stigma of being poor, simply by comparison with those who have more. Also, poverty

may be group-wise, a condition of a whole community, tribe, or nation; or it may be individual and familial, limited to a few in the midst of group plenty.

Historically, judging by present standards, group poverty has been the rule throughout the long period that man has occupied the earth; and, until recently, populations which have risen above want have been few and exceptional. With the culmination of the Industrial Revolution the peoples of Northwestern Europe and North America escaped from group poverty except as it came as the aftermath of prolonged and costly wars. These same countries have seen great reduction in the amount and extent of absolute poverty until it has become virtually unknown to them. However, to keep our perspective, we must note that other peoples, making up well over half the world's population, still live, normally, in conditions of absolute group poverty. The peoples of India, China, most of Africa, and large parts of Latin America, as well as of other parts of the earth, mostly live out their lives in what we would consider appalling misery because of the lack of the most elementary necessities.[1]

For our own and similar groups, poverty is mostly individual and familial, and relative. It is in reference, not so much to absolute needs, as to somewhat arbitrary cultural "standards of decency and comfort." The extent of poverty in modern industrial nations is measured in relation to particular assumptions of how much people *should* have. In our own culture group, many families are considered distressingly poor by themselves and their neighbors even though they eat well and regularly, are housed in safe and healthy homes, and have automobiles and savings. Other families, having far less in all these regards may consider themselves, and be considered by their neighbors, as "well-to-do." Thus, in our own society, poverty is a confused and complex problem.[2]

World Contrasts. A very small percentage of the people of the world control most of the accessible natural resources and technological equipment. The great majority of people have little to be divided among them, and what little may be statistically ascribed to them as populations is concentrated in the hands of a few individuals. The generally destitute population of India, for example, includes a few of the wealthiest families on earth. Others of the poorer peoples present some of the world's greatest contrasts between miserable want and great wealth.

[1] At present, as an aftermath of war, a large portion of Europe must be included in such a list.

[2] John L. Gillin, *Poverty and Dependency,* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937. See especially Chapters III and IV.

Although many hundreds of millions of people throughout the world have so little, the productive machinery of the more advanced countries (in a technological sense) is not often operated to full capacity except in time of total war. Nations such as our own are frequently plagued by surpluses which depress prices and business activities; to them, occasional scarcities which speed business enterprise come as economic blessings. Why such paradoxes? The answers which social science can now give are fragmentary and tentative. Chief among the causes of all poverty is the fact that no one entirely understands the working of present-day economic forces.

Poverty in the United States

There are considerable statistical groups with relatively low income, even in the United States. Within such groups, however, there are gradations in comparative possession or command of the goods and services of the economy, as well as fluctuations in the fortunes of the group. As we are most familiar with poverty, it is relative rather than absolute. Persons and families are poor by comparison with what they have been or hope to be, or in contrast to others in their community. Cases of actual starvation are almost unknown. Relief agencies and charitable organizations abound to care for those who are patently unable to gain their own livlihood.

The extent of relative poverty, in terms of commonly accepted standards, varies greatly from time to time and is closely correlated with phases of the business cycle. In the depth of the depression of the early 1930's, the generally accepted estimate was that one-third of the American population was living below cultural standards of health and decency. During the prosperity of the Second World War and the boom which followed immediately, the proportion was very much lower. A paradox of our national economy is that, whether in prosperity or depression, poverty tends to exist side by side with great surpluses of material goods and is, in fact, a by-product of such surpluses. If there is an abundance of food products, prices to farmers may be so depressed that thousands of farm families become insolvent; if the surpluses are in industrial products, plants close, workers are unemployed, and poverty stalks city streets. The illogic of such situations is apparent to all, but their rational control is still a baffling problem.

In relative terms, poverty is regional. Some sections of the United States, principally the rural southeastern states, characteristically have lower living levels than other regions. Such states as New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California have higher per capita incomes and more public funds than other states. In terms of economic

division of functions, agriculture has been, except, perhaps, in time of war and immediately after, at a disadvantage in comparison with other segments of the economy. On the basis of population divisions, poverty is more characteristic of the "colored" racial elements and unassimilated ethnic minorities than of other groups. It prevails largely in the upper age groups in contrast to those in lower age groups. In cities, it is most to be found in a few districts, mainly those near the business center where living conditions are worst and congestion is greatest.

Vicious Circle of Poverty. In a highly competitive society, such as our own, poverty tends to perpetuate itself in families. This is because poverty carries with it the conditions which render individuals unfit for competition and denies them those benefits which would increase their efficiency. If poorly fed, the children of an impoverished family are more prone to diseases which lower their vitality, or even handicap them for life. The children of the poor must often live in areas where moral and other influences are worst, and where incentives to constructive effort are least. They usually are deprived of educational advantages which are available to others, both in school and at home. They usually lack influential relatives and friends to help them become established in lucrative careers, and the money necessary to get a favorable start in adult life. Their own children, in turn, probably will be confronted with the same or greater deficiencies of opportunity and incentive to rise above poverty, and such complexes of circumstances often repeat themselves generation after generation until large family groups come to accept poverty as a normal and inescapable way of life. So frequently does this self-perpetuating and familial phase of poverty recur in our society that it is often mistaken for tainted biological heredity. The sequences of conditions are so obvious, however, that the resort to such an explanation is usually superfluous.

To be entirely accurate it must be noted that, especially in our open-class society, there are many cases of persons and families who rise in the socio-economic scale despite such obstacles as have been enumerated. These cases are exaggerated in our cultural ideology, however. Much more acceptable to us as a people is the oft-repeated story of the handicapped individual or family who rises to the "top" than is the more commonplace and less dramatic story of the many individuals and families that do not.

Engel's Law. One aspect of the vicious circle of poverty is the principle known to economists as Engel's law. It is simply the well-substantiated observation that the lower the income of the family, the greater the proportion of that income that must go to supply the necessities of life—

food, clothing, and shelter.[3] This means that for low income groups, only a very small fraction of income, or none at all, can go for savings, education, recreation, and general self-improvement. Conversely, the higher the income of the family, the larger the proportion that can be used for purposes which tend to uphold and improve the family's economic situation and improve the competitive efficiency of its members. Professional education, attendance at graduate schools of business administration, degrees from high-prestige universities, all require money expenditures far beyond the reach of the lowest income groups.

Explanations of Poverty

Heredity and Poverty. As noted above, the tendency of poverty to run in families is so marked that many theorists have been inclined to ascribe the condition to inferior biological heredity. Because this type of explanation is found in connection with nearly all social problems, it is well to give it some consideration here. When poverty is ascribed to biological heredity, it is assumed that complexes of human characteristics—intelligence, energy, ambition, and moral character—are passed in a highly regular and predictable manner through the genes which determine heredity from parents to offspring. On the surface, this appears to be a fairly simple explanation, but it does not come from careful or critical study of observed facts, nor from complete understanding of the operation of heredity in living organisms. Practically all that we know about human heredity is by generalizing from knowledge of the process among plants and non-human animals, where controlled experiment and systematic observation of large numbers of cases through many generations is possible. Among human beings such conditions of study are impossible. It is probably quite sound to infer that such simple unit characteristics as color of eyes and hair, outstanding facial features, etc., are largely hereditary. But when it comes to such vague, complex, and poorly defined qualities as general intelligence, temperament, and attitudes, we do violence to what scientific knowledge we have in ascribing them to the same hereditary mechanisms. As will be noted in a later chapter, we are much more secure in the realm of the verifiable and scientifically valid when we ascribe such qualities to social conditioning of maturing personalities.[4]

The "heredity" which most obviously lies behind the tendency of poverty to run in families is the kind suggested in the discussion of the vicious circle of poverty, social heredity. Every individual is born into,

[3] See Meyer F. Nimkoff, *Marriage and the Family*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947, pp. 175 ff.

[4] Some, but not all the complexities of eugenics are discussed in E. L. Thorndike, *Human Nature and the Social Order*, The Macmillan Co., 1940, pp. 442ff.

and therefore inherits, the whole set of life circumstances in which his parents live. These circumstances provide him with the opportunity for, and incentive to, develop efficiency for competition with others in economic as well as other life activities. Life circumstances can and do change, and they differ, even among children of the same parents; but usually such changes and variations lie within fairly narrow limits.[5]

Poverty and Population. The relationship of poverty to population characteristics is so complicated by other factors that it is not always clear. For large groups we have such concepts as "over-population" and "under-population," each being relative, of course, to the variables of accessible natural resources and stage of technological development. Economists use the term "optimum population" to describe a theoretical population size for a given area, with given resources, which, with a given technological development, will enjoy the highest general living standards. Almost complete lack of accepted criteria for measuring these variables, however, leaves us without any definite way of knowing what over-, under-, and optimum populations are for any area. No one can say with certainty whether the United States is over-, under-, or optimum-populated at the present time, and authorities give us conflicting opinions.

It is mainly in family size, with implied differential birth rates, that we have a reasonably clear-cut correlation with relative poverty. It has been an observation of many students of population that, allowing for many exceptions, the families of the poor are larger and contain more children than the families of the wealthy; so that it is a general rule that the smaller the income, the more persons it must support. But historical trends enter interestingly into this equation since, in the United States, for instance, the average family size of low-income groups now is smaller than was the average family size of the well-to-do a few generations ago.

Poverty and Technology. Rapid technological advance, as we have known it in this country, makes for rise in general living standards, but not necessarily for less poverty—especially of relative poverty. The benefits of technological advances are not equally available to all segments of the population or all families. We know that many people live in homes which are overcrowded and lacking in the most rudimentary sanitary facilities. Much of the drudgery, whether of farming or housekeeping, is still done by hand labor unrelieved by the hundreds of labor-saving devices and machines we like to consider as commonplaces of our material culture. One general effect of advanced technology has been that production has tended to outstrip distribution so that great surpluses

[5] Nimkoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 179ff.

pile up and, by their very existence, make for low prices, unemployment, and wide-spread poverty. A more specific phase of technological advance is technological unemployment when a mechanized process displaces labor, resulting in much poverty, temporary or permanent.

The Business Cycle

In our own economic system, important among tangible causes of wide-spread poverty are the periodic fluctuations in business activity referred to by economists as the business cycle. Over varying periods of years the economy runs through a succession of changes known as prosperity, recession, depression, recovery, and a return to prosperity. Each phase is characterized by variations, more or less measurable in statistical terms, and involving such indices as price and wage levels, bank clearings, stock and bond quotations, the movement of goods in transport, employment, and production. When all or most of these indices are at highest levels we have prosperity and comparatively little poverty. When all or most are at very low levels we have depression and wide-spread poverty. In the in-between phases, when indices are falling we have recession, and when they are rising we have recovery.

Increase in Intensity. Most students of business cycles remark that throughout our economic history the cycles have shown definite long-run trends—to become increasingly world-wide, and to show greater intensity, so that prosperity peaks and depths of depression tend to stand in sharper contrast to each other. This has led to growing concern with problems of control of the cycles, either to eliminate them, or what seems more nearly feasible, alleviate their extreme effects.

The various phases of the cycles seem to grow out of previous phases. Thus, prosperity characterized by upward spiraling wages, prices, and land values, is often called inflation and seems to be the prelude to the opposite type of spiral, or deflation. Many hold that the greater the inflation, the more violent the deflation will be. The greater the prosperity, the deeper the following depression appears to be. Indicated as controls over the business cycles are two courses: one, control by private enterprise through voluntary resistance both to inflation and deflation; and government fiscal policy aimed at leveling the peaks and cushioning the depths of the cycle. In much over-simplified terms, the government policy of control would call first for budgets to cover entire business cycles instead of fiscal year by fiscal year. In general, it would mean that government would reduce expenditures and would tax heavily in times of prosperity and spend heavily while reducing taxes in periods of recession and depression.

Such fundamental changes in our economy as are advocated meet strong resistance, primarily for three reasons. Although economists, looking back at past fluctuations in business conditions, can agree quite closely on the various phases, there is wide disagreement when it comes to assessing the present situation and predicting for the future. Control programs must be applied in terms of present and future, not to business cycles that have already run their course. A second reason for resistance to change lies in the fact that measures that would probably benefit the general business structure might, at a given time, be very harmful to particular firms, industries, or regions, or to vast numbers of workers. It is much easier to see our individual interests in terms of the concrete and immediate than in terms of any abstractions such as general business conditions. The third basis of resistance lies in our reluctance to permit further government incursions into the fields which we have traditionally come to define as those of private enterprise.

Credit and Debt. The long-term rise in general living standards in our economy has been accompanied by a general expansion of credit. It is estimated that more than eighty-five per cent of business transactions in this country are based upon credit rather than exchanges of actual money. This is pertinent for the problem of poverty because the obverse side of credit is debt, and the expansion of credit has meant continuous growth in the burden of debts—governmental, corporate, or individual and familial.

In the business cycle, recovery and prosperity are accompanied by easier and expanding credit—and debt. Bank credits, loans, and installment buying are available to people and business firms. In recession loans and credit are hard to get, credit institutions and business houses insist on collecting what is due them, and since there is never sufficient money to offset all outstanding credits, there are wide-spread bankruptcy and financial losses, which tend to further tighten credit restrictions. Farm owners lose their mortgaged farms, town and city dwellers their homes and savings, and governmental units find taxes difficult to collect.

Economic Security

From what has been said about the credit-debt structure as related both to long-term trends and the business cycle it can readily be seen that security of the individual, especially in groups living in or near poverty, is an ever-increasing problem. When we consider the increase of the proportion of aged persons in our population, the trend in this direction takes on poignant meaning. It is axiomatic that a modicum of economic security is necessary to the happiness and well-being of individuals; but

individuals are highly dependent upon social arrangements over which they have comparatively little control for that security.

Economic security means not only provision for support in old age, but also provision for meeting life's emergencies as they arise, such as sickness, disablement, and unemployment. The immediate reliance for such security, for most individuals, lies in family organization. Under conditions in which general living standards are low so that wants are few and simple, families and households are large with most members sharing in productive enterprise, and households are largely self-sufficient in producing most of the goods and services they need, such security may be quite adequate. In our society, however, living standards have been rising and wants increasing. The family-household unit has declined in size until the norm is dependence upon a single wage earner rather than many productive workers. Families produce less and less of their own necessities, and buy more and more in the market place with money or credit based upon anticipated income. Thus the dependence upon family for economic security becomes less workable and adequate for those who have small and precarious incomes.

With the decline in the adequacy of security in the family system there has come the rise of various kinds of commercial insurance against life hazards. Such programs, because of their cost, have been relatively unavailable to the low income groups whose problems of security are greatest. The depression of the 1930's revealed clearly how lacking in security a large part of our population is, and led to assumption by government of a large share of responsibility of economic security of individuals in the enactment of the Social Security law.

The Social Security Act. Following similar enactments by other national governments, the United States in 1935 adopted the Social Security Act, which has since been amended consistently in the direction of more adequate provisions for larger proportions of the population. The Act set up a cooperative arrangement between the states and the Federal government to make effective a number of programs, all designed to alleviate and to prevent poverty. One important provision is for state systems of unemployment insurance, under which, for limited periods, workers and their dependents are provided for in case of loss of work. Another provision is insurance for old age administered by the Federal Government and providing for cash benefits to retired aged persons and their families. Other provisions under which the Federal Government makes grants to states to help finance state-administered programs include assistance for dependent children of families deprived of the support of the father; programs providing for public services to promote maternal and child

health; aid for crippled children; care for neglected children, especially in rural areas; and pensions for the needy blind.

Exempted from insurance benefits of the Social Security Act are farm workers, the self-employed, domestic servants, and other considerable numbers who may at times find themselves in poverty. To care for such "uncovered" persons and groups each state carries a program of general relief which is locally financed. There are numerous special provisions under which the Federal Government gives special assistance in credits and services to the lowest income segments of the farm population.

Recognized as a need yet to be met by national legislation in order to prevent poverty and provide for those in poverty adequately is some program for making medical care more accessible to low income persons and groups. Specific proposals for such legislation have been before the Congress for many years, but continue to meet with strong resistance. Other suggestions for rendering security greater for the individual in our society include that for an annual wage for the worker.[6]

The scope of present governmental programs to provide for individual security is limited; and, although it is being extended, it still leaves unprotected many of the most distressingly poor. These unprotected people must place their reliance for security, such as it is, in continued governmental relief programs and private charity. Nevertheless, the long run trend is clear, and more and more, in the future, it may be safely predicted that provision for security of individuals will be accepted as a responsibility of government.

Poverty and Health. One of the most strongly resisted phases of the extension of economic security is that which would place in government responsibility for medical care of individuals—usually referred to as socialized medicine. Already noted has been the place of sickness, both as cause and effect, in the vicious circle of poverty. Certainly it is obvious from all studies that death rates are higher and the incidence of disease greater the further one goes down the economic scale. Two things of great social significance are involved—sickness tends to perpetuate and increase poverty and thus the general economic burden that wide-spread poverty means; and the existence of disease in any element of the population is a hazard to the health of other elements. The poor often are also the ignorant and lack both the means and knowledge necessary for maintaining conditions and diets which are conducive to good health. They have but limited access to physicians, costly drugs, and hospitals. Except for large-scale government intervention there appears to be little prospect

[6] Paul H. Douglas, *Social Security in the United States,* Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Second Edition, 1939.

of adequately meeting this condition. Here, however, strong traditions, fear of untried programs, and numerous types of vested interests make changes exceedingly difficult and slow.

The American Class System

All societies have some form of class structure in which groups have various degrees of prestige and the privileges of different ranges of social participation. American social structure has an intricate series of social classes arranged in pyramid form with the few at the top and the many at the bottom. Traditionally it has been an open-class system in which individuals and families may rise or fall according to their worth, efforts, and good or ill fortune. All classes, however, tend to perpetuate their own advantages and to exclude members of lower classes from entering them, so that there is a tendency for class distinctions to become rigid. Although many qualifications go into determining class status—family, education, occupation, etc.—the most important criteria in the United States are the obvious signs of greater wealth and income, and the class system closely parallels the position of individuals and families in the economic scale. Thus poverty tends to place and hold persons in the lower classes, with the stigma and restrictions of privileges that are implied.[7]

Race and Ethnic Discrimination. In this country more than in some others, poverty accompanied by racial or ethnic discrimination tends to bring about class distinctions which in rigidity resemble caste distinctions as virtually unsurpassable barriers. This means, for those bearing such distinctive traits, further limitation of wealth gaining opportunities and thus tends to perpetuate poverty. Such discriminations have some bases in law, such as statutes forbidding orientals from owning certain types of property in Pacific Coast states, but they are mainly extra-legal and imbedded in mores, such as those found in reference to Negroes, especially in the South.

The Study of Poverty

Understanding the problem of poverty involves, to a large extent, the approach of economics, as this chapter clearly indicates. The programs for alleviation of poverty involve government and politics, as in the case of the Social Security Act and its amendments. Control of such causative factors as business cycles is a concern of both economists and political

[7] Article by P. Mombert, "Class," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, The Macmillan Co., 1935.

scientists. The approach of sociologists emphasizes the relation of poverty to the class and caste systems in the social organization. History is concerned with poverty as it has been a factor in social and political upheavals such as revolutions, as well as the governmental reforms which, from time immemorial, have been brought about to meet pressures due to wide-spread poverty. The anthropologist gives us mainly the picture of extreme and unrelenting poverty as the normal life condition of primitive peoples, and as a contributing source of many cultural practices and patterns. From the viewpoint of social psychologists, poverty is mainly a condition which leads to warping frustration in the development and functioning of human personalities. Thus, as in the case of the problem of war, from its own distinctive viewpoint, each of the social sciences contributes to the understanding of the problem. While these diverse answers lend themselves readily to integration into a coherent whole, as yet they have given no certain and conclusive solution to the problem.

Summary

The problem of poverty is treated so as to bring out principally the many ramifications of a social problem. Both as cause and effect, poverty ties in with every phase of organized group life, although in different culture groups it is somewhat different in significance. For very considerable segments of the world population—sometimes called the pre-industrial peoples, poverty is group-wise and absolute, meaning lack of the very necessities for healthful living. In other societies, as our own, it is more characteristically individual and familial, and relative to accepted standards of "decency and comfort." In our own culture scheme we have the startling paradoxes of want in the midst of plenty and of "over-production" as itself a cause of poverty. Primary among causes are the increasingly violent fluctuations in the working of our economy called business cycles. The changes that would be needed to control business cycles, to increase the efficiency of distribution in the face of expanding productive technology, and for government adequately to assume responsibility for individual security, meet the strong resistance of our traditions of individual free enterprise and self-reliance. This opposition of forces illustrates the basic formula for social problems.

In the study of poverty we encounter a type of fallacious explanation which recurs frequently in connection with various social problems, the ascribing of such a complex cultural and social phenomenon to the operation of biological heredity. A brief examination of the facts of heredity, as they are known, and the obvious observable social facts indicate how erroneous and inadequate such an explanation is.

Terms

Stigma
Statistical group
Age group
Ideology
Fiscal policy
Genes
Conditioning
Optimum population
Indices
Inflation
Deflation

Questions

1. Distinguish between "relative poverty" and "absolute poverty."
2. Describe the "vicious circle" of poverty in terms of Engel's Law.
3. Why are explanations of poverty in terms of biological heredity inadequate?
4. How might government fiscal policy be used to control business cycles?
5. How is the rising living standard related to credit and debt?
6. How does poverty affect the social class structure?

READING LIST

Sir William Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services,* American Edition. The Macmillan Co., 1942.

J. Colcord, *Cash Relief.* Russell Sage Foundation, 1936.

Paul H. Douglas, *Social Security in the United States.* Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939.

A. D. Gayer, *Monetary Policy and Economic Stabilization.* The Macmillan Co., 1937.

John L. Gillin, *Poverty and Dependency.* D. Appleton-Century Co., Third Edition, 1937.

M. Leven, H. G. Moulton, and C. Warburton, *America's Capacity to Consume.* Brookings Institution, 1934.

Robert Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.

Maurice Parmalee, *Farewell to Poverty.* John Wiley & Sons, 1935.

C. Ware and G. C. Means, *The Modern Economy in Action.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936.

Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community.* Yale University Press, 1941.

Harvey W. Zorbaugh, *The Gold Coast and the Slum.* University of Chicago Press, 1929.

CHAPTER VII

Race and Ethnic Conflict

In almost every part of the world dominant groups practice discrimination against other groups who differ from them racially or in cultural attributes, a fact that often contributes to the problem of poverty and enters into determination of class and caste distinctions. Such discriminations are recognized by students of social sciences as a threat to group welfare, because they frequently lead to violent outbreaks; and they obviously are the cause of maladjustments for large numbers of individuals. To eliminate or alleviate the problem would call for extensive changes in social organization and in the values and sentiments of peoples. These changes everywhere meet with strong resistance.

Race and ethnic conflicts vary in form and intensity, from time to time, and from place to place. They vary with closeness of contact between groups and the extent to which the interests of the groups are in competition. Just as noted in the case of relations among nation-states, basically the conflicts among racial and ethnic groups may be considered as examples of the in-group versus out-group characteristics of organized group life, for in them lies the assumption by one group that it is superior and that other cultural and racial groups are inferior. Usually the superiority-inferiority contrast is looked upon as being fixed in the very nature of things, and therefore unchangeable.

There exists an abundance of data regarding races and ethnic groups, but, as one authority recently wrote:[1]

> Racial relations themselves are incompletely analyzed and imperfectly described. They seem to begin at the point where partly acculturated and imperfectly assimilated members of the excluded group, aspiring to membership in the superior group and seeking to participate in its cultural life, are repulsed and their wishes denied. The excluded individuals become racially self-conscious and develop into conflict groups that are at once dependent upon and potentially at war with the group in whose culture they desire to participate. In the struggle for rights that they feel are unjustly denied them, they

[1] E. B. Reuter, "Racial Theory," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. L, No. 6 (May, 1945), p. 460.

develop organization, initiate movements, construct ideologies, and otherwise evolve the complex machinery that goes with organized political activity. The details of the procedure apparently display the whole collective behavior process. A body of careful research in the field of racial movements is a prerequisite to an understanding of the natural history of race relations.

Racial Differences

The peoples of the world may be divided into large groups according to obvious physiological characteristics which run fairly uniformly within each group and distinguish its members from those of other groups. Such characteristics give every evidence of being hereditary, and therefore remain constant through time, as well as throughout the group. Among these characteristics is skin pigmentation. Peoples may be divided into the relatively fair skinned and relatively dark skinned, which leads to the rather broad classification of populations into the light race and the colored races of man.

This kind of difference led to early classification of peoples into the white, black, red, yellow, and brown races. Such classification, still often found in popular and pseudo-scientific writing, is based upon faulty observation. There is, for instance, no such thing as a white person, the very thought of one being ghastly. Those who are called "white" are persons of a wide variety of skin colors and shadings from delicate pink to brown. The American Indian, so often referred to as the *red* man, is never red, and seldom copper-colored. Among Indians, again, there is a wide range of skin colors and shades. The same may be said of the other colored groups. So great is the range of skin pigmentation within each racial group that there are, of course, many overlappings; and any clear-cut distinctions simply on the basis of skin color become impracticable. It must be noted, also, that skin color is, with each individual, quite variable under different conditions. One may acquire a "tan" by spending a summer swimming at the beach, or a palor by being confined to a sick-bed. Persons blush or become pale under the stress of strong emotions. The use of skin pigmentation by itself is insufficient for dividing people into racial groups.

Skin pigmentation often combines with characteristics of hair which varies in lightness and darkness, in texture, in degree of straightness or curl, in presence or relative lack on face and body, especially among males. A moment's reflection, however, will indicate how unreliable this criterion, by itself, may be, because, like skin color, the color and other characteristics of a person's hair may change. In a given individual, the shade of hair may vary considerably during a lifetime. In our cultur

people of this original group wandered to greater and greater distances from their starting point, until they reached all parts of the habitable globe. These groups lived, again through countless generations, in various contrasting climates and other physiographic conditions. In adapting to such conditions there developed the biological characteristics which now are used in classing peoples into racial groups.

The polygenetic theory ascribes a different area of origin, different ancestry, and different time of origin, to each major racial grouping. This kind of theory lends itself to classification of races as being more or less "primitive" in the evolutionary scale. The idea of such degrees of primitiveness is usually supported by comparisons of skeletal and other characteristics to those of "lower" animal forms, especially those of the anthropoid apes. Such evidence, on careful examination, however, is far from conclusive and often conflicting, because human types that most resemble apes in some features of their anatomy are likely to have the least resemblance in other features. Science cannot now definitely answer the questions raised by the two theories because of lack of factual knowledge; it can only weigh probabilities in the light of known facts and, in so doing, scientists differ in their conclusions.

Sub-races of Man

Within the generally accepted classification of racial families as Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid there are further classifications of peoples into sub-racial groups.

The Caucasoid group includes, for instance, the Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean sub-races, more closely related to each other than to sub-races of the Mongoloid or Negroid peoples, but still, to an extent, distinguishable from one another. Some scientists would include other Caucasoid sub-races, but there is less agreement as to them. The Nordic peoples are presumably those of Northern and Western Europe and their descendants. They are the most blond peoples, on the average, are tall and long headed, and include the English, Scotch, Germans, Scandinavians, most people of Northern France and the Low Countries. The peoples of the Alpine sub-race are intermediate between blond and brunette, not so tall, tend to be round-headed, and include largely the peoples of Central Europe and their descendants. The Mediterranean peoples are those of Southern Europe and their offspring—dark, relatively slight of stature, with long heads and long, narrow faces. The people of the United States, descendants of all these peoples, classify as predominantly Caucasoid, with unascertainable proportions of Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean, as well as mixed types. When careful study is made of the peoples of Europe it is found that the geographic arrangement

major racial lines, and more especially among sub-races. Peoples of "pure" racial stock, if any exist, are highly exceptional, despite all claims to the contrary, as far as scientific evidence is concerned. It is interesting to note that the ancestry of all human beings goes back many hundreds of generations; and few individuals can, with any degree of certainty, trace their descent for more than four or five generations. As will be noted later, those groups who have the strongest traditions of "pure" descent through many centuries find their claims running contrary to the strongest historical probabilities. Some few extremely isolated peoples, as Eskimos and the aborigines of Australia, may lay some claim to racial purity, but the evidence is conjectural and open to doubt.

Racial mixture takes place wherever differing racial groups are long in contact. From a biological standpoint it does not matter whether such mixture complies with local mores and folkways and is thus sanctioned by intermarriage, or whether it occurs clandestinely and outside of marriage bonds. However, where mixture is sanctioned, and therefore carries no social penalties, it will be much more rapid than otherwise. The earliest Spanish explorers of parts of what are now the United States mixed with Indians. Later Nordic Europeans—the French and English—mixed with Indians. Throughout the history of Negro slavery and since emancipation there has been racial mixture between Caucasoid, Negroid, and Indian peoples. How much such mixture there has been is not determined, and scientists disagree widely in their conjectural answers; but that it has occurred and still does take place is generally agreed.

It seems evident that all racial groups can intermix and bear offspring, that such mixed racial groups can intermix and in turn bear offspring, and so on indefinitely, which would seem to give strong support to theories which hold that all mankind belongs to a single species rather than to many. The mixture of racial strains does not, of itself, cause either deterioration or improvement of the stock as far as can be factually determined. Of course, if intermixture is strongly condemned in group mores, the children born of such mixture may be so penalized by the group that they have poorer diets and living conditions, and lesser opportunities, so that from social causes the individuals may suffer physically, mentally, and morally to an extent which sets them apart from other more advantaged individuals. Such differences result from social factors, however, and are not biological in origin. This is emphasized because it runs counter to widely held beliefs.[2]

---

2 Count deGobineau and his numerous followers, the creators of the "Aryan myth" have held to the contrary and their principal thesis has been that race mixture accounts for the inferiority of "backward" peoples. For views which are much sounder, scientifically, see O. Klineberg, *Race Differences*, Harper & Bros., 1935; and Ruth Benedict *Race: Science and Politics*, Modern Age, 1941.

peoples by sub-racial types is not as neat as it might seem from the above generalizations, but resembles rather the arrangement of scraps in a crazy-quilt. It further appears that clear-cut sub-racial types are relatively few and rare, and most peoples have mixed characteristics of two or all three sub-races.

Mongoloid Sub-races. Among the Mongoloid peoples there are several distinguishable sub-types, such as the North and South Chinese, the Mongolian, the Eskimo, and the American Indian. Here, again, the same difficulty arises upon close study of these groups in efforts to clearly differentiate them as sub-races. The American Indians are an example close at hand. They include peoples of wide differences of skin pigmentation and facial features, of stature ranging from the characteristically short to very tall, some closely resembling Asiatic peoples such as the Chinese, others having little resemblance. The same ranges of characteristics may be found in the other Mongoloid sub-racial groups, with evidence of much intermixture among them.

Negroid Sub-races. The Negroid sub-races are also numerous. Some Negroid peoples are pygmies; others are tall in stature. Skin pigmentation ranges from very dark to relatively light, and in other characteristics there are notable differences which are variously used for classification into sub-racial groups. Again there is much overlapping and mixture of characteristics among the supposed sub-racial groups so that categories are usually far from distinct.

On a level with the sub-races which fall into the general scheme of three major racial families there are a number of peoples who do not fall into any one of the three, or in whose classification scientists are in disagreement, as for example the Ainus of Japan and the Maoris of New Zealand. These peoples, living in various parts of the world, are relatively few in numbers, and it suffices here simply to indicate their existence as a further complication in the racial classification of human beings.

As stated before, most of the people of the United States are descended principally from the Caucasoid sub-races; about one-tenth are principally of Negroid stock; whereas the original population, the Indians, and a few later arrivals are of Mongoloid descent. All racial and most sub-racial groups combine to make up our present population.

Race Mixture

As already indicated, close study of the peoples of the world indicates that most people are probably of mixed racial origin. Certainly there is ample evidence of race mixture in all parts of the world, across the

major racial lines, and more especially among sub-races. Peoples of "pure" racial stock, if any exist, are highly exceptional, despite all claims to the contrary, as far as scientific evidence is concerned. It is interesting to note that the ancestry of all human beings goes back many hundreds of generations; and few individuals can, with any degree of certainty, trace their descent for more than four or five generations. As will be noted later, those groups who have the strongest traditions of "pure" descent through many centuries find their claims running contrary to the strongest historical probabilities. Some few extremely isolated peoples, as Eskimos and the aborigines of Australia, may lay some claim to racial purity, but the evidence is conjectural and open to doubt.

Racial mixture takes place wherever differing racial groups are long in contact. From a biological standpoint it does not matter whether such mixture complies with local mores and folkways and is thus sanctioned by intermarriage, or whether it occurs clandestinely and outside of marriage bonds. However, where mixture is sanctioned, and therefore carries no social penalties, it will be much more rapid than otherwise. The earliest Spanish explorers of parts of what are now the United States mixed with Indians. Later Nordic Europeans—the French and English—mixed with Indians. Throughout the history of Negro slavery and since emancipation there has been racial mixture between Caucasoid, Negroid, and Indian peoples. How much such mixture there has been is not determined, and scientists disagree widely in their conjectural answers; but that it has occurred and still does take place is generally agreed.

It seems evident that all racial groups can intermix and bear offspring, that such mixed racial groups can intermix and in turn bear offspring, and so on indefinitely, which would seem to give strong support to theories which hold that all mankind belongs to a single species rather than to many. The mixture of racial strains does not, of itself, cause either deterioration or improvement of the stock as far as can be factually determined. Of course, if intermixture is strongly condemned in group mores, the children born of such mixture may be so penalized by the group that they have poorer diets and living conditions, and lesser opportunities, so that from social causes the individuals may suffer physically, mentally, and morally to an extent which sets them apart from other more advantaged individuals. Such differences result from social factors, however, and are not biological in origin. This is emphasized because it runs counter to widely held beliefs.[2]

2 Count deGobineau and his numerous followers, the creators of the "Aryan myth" have held to the contrary and their principal thesis has been that race mixture accounts for the inferiority of "backward" peoples. For views which are much sounder, scientifically, see O. Klineberg, *Race Differences*, Harper & Bros., 1935; and Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics*, Modern Age, 1941.

Race Psychology

The obvious physiological differences and disparities in social rank among racial groups have led to the supposition that there must be parallel differences in the neuropsychic make-up of members of such groups. For the last fifty years a great deal of scientific research has gone into efforts to measure and further define such differences. At first such studies seemed to confirm the suppositions of innate racial psychological characteristics, but when they were examined critically and due allowance was made for obvious differences in opportunity, incentive to performance, and limitations in social participation, the results have come to be re-evaluated as uniformly negative. They have not, with validity, established that there is any significant difference in mental capacity or type of mind; nor that there is any significant difference in temperament which can be ascribed to race as such. In other words, as far as we can say from a considerable amount of observation and evidence, all races are the same in these regards.[3] There do exist, of course, among individuals of any one racial group wide differences in mental abilities, as well as in emotional factors, but how many of these can be ascribed to innate, and how much to acquired, characteristics remains, in itself, obscure.

The Racial Myths

In contrast to the complex and often inconclusive scientific generalizations about race, as indicated above, is the pat certainty of answers found in racial myths which abound among peoples. Such myths have existed among nearly all peoples. One of the most persistent historically has been the belief that there is a clearly distinguishable Jewish race, widely believed by both Jewish and non-Jewish people. The Jews have shared a religion and some degree of cultural identity for a remarkably long period of time, but such attributes are traditional, not racial, in the scientific sense of the term. There are Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid Jews, even though the great majority are Caucasoid. There are Jews with chiefly Nordic, or Alpine, or Mediterranean characteristics.

Racial myths, wherever found, are ethnocentric and one expression of the universal in-group versus out-group relationships of humanity. They clearly imply, if they do not actually proclaim, the supposed innate superiority of members of one race to members of other races and, conversely, the innate inferiority of particular racial groups. Because Europeans and their descendants have learned to place high values on science, it has become necessary to dress the racial myths in seemingly scientific garb. The current pseudoscientific system of beliefs is probably

[3] Klineberg, *op. cit.*

best illustrated by the Aryan myth which was compounded late in the last century by a French diplomatic traveler, from a number of ideas then current, and supported by his own observations of peoples of Europe and South America. The originator of the Aryan myth, Count deGobineau, reached the following conclusions:

The Aryan Myth. In the past mankind was divided into a number of clear-cut pure races, but through the ages most races have been contaminated by race mixture. Race mixture inevitably brings progressive deterioration to peoples.

Of the few remaining pure racial stocks the outstanding is the Aryan race, threatened always with admixture and deterioration, but still intact.

Therefore the Aryan race is the most advanced, and contains the greatest promise for further development. It is, in effect, the hope for further progress for mankind.

It is incumbent upon the Aryan race to maintain its purity at all cost; and to take over the domination and leadership of other less pure and therefore inferior peoples.

This theory, with further embellishments, was popularized by the English writer, Chamberlain. Through him it reached German scholars who, in turn, made it into the basis for German racial policies, especially those aimed against Jews and those supporting the notions that the German people were destined world rulers. Although the Germans carried the notion to extremes, in one form or another, the theory—modern racism—has been widely adopted to justify imperialism and colonial rule, and racial discriminations as found in many parts of the United States.

Other Racial Fictions. There are numerous other racial fictions for which scientific validity is often claimed even though the evidence does not stand up under critical scrutiny. One of these is the notion of racial poisons—the idea that foods, drinks, and drugs which members of some races can absorb with impunity are poisonous to members of other races. An example of this notion is found imbedded in our Federal laws which makes illegal the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, although such drinks may be sold to, and imbibed by, members of other racial groups. Closely related are fictions that some racial groups, as races, have peculiar susceptibility or immunity to particular diseases. An example has been the notion that the Negro, as a Negro, was particularly vulnerable to the ravages of tuberculosis. It is obvious that most American Negroes live under conditions of diet and lack of sanitation which will fully account for the diseases which flourish among them, as they do among their neighbors living similarly, the "poor whites" of the South. Many

other fictions about innate racial differences could be enumerated, but all stem from the same general misconceptions of race.

The principal fact is that racial myths, lacking factual support and often running counter to existing evidence, have, in the past, and continue now to exert, more influence on human relations than do the involved findings of science. Racism, as a doctrine and program to support in-group solidarity, through hostility to out-groups, is a widespread and powerful force in the world today.

Confusion of Concepts

In a previous chapter the concept of culture as used among social scientists was briefly discussed. To scientists, culture includes the aggregate of ways of doing, thinking, and feeling common to large groups of people who may thus be distinguished from other groups. The most casual observation will reveal that in every race and sub-race there are many cultures. For instance, among the American Indians every tribal group had its own dialect, religion, economy, arts, etc. Among African Negroes there were and are scores of cultures. It is a mistake on the basis of such observations to speak of the Indian or the African culture without specifying which of the many culture groups, specifically, is meant. It is also obvious that members of different races and sub-races share the same culture. In the United States we find that the Negroes (with very few exceptions) speak the same language, have the same religions, practice the same arts, etc., as do the Caucasoids. Culture, then, is not to be confused with race, because culture cuts across racial lines and divides racial groups.

Nationality refers to people owing identical national allegiance, regardless of race or culture. Caucasoids, and members of each of the sub-races of European descent, belong to scores of different nations. In many of these nations there are fellow nationals of Mongoloid and Negroid characteristics, and of various sub-races in these categories. Obviously, race and nationality do not coincide necessarily, or even usually. Nor do culture and nationality coincide, for, in the great world empires, peoples of many cultures owe common national allegiance. On the other hand, peoples of different nations, as Canadians and the people of the United States, share the same general culture. There may be closer cultural affinity across national boundaries, as between the natives of Yucatan and Guatamala, than within a given nation.

Language is another distinctive quality of peoples which does not coincide, necessarily, with culture, or nationality, or *race*. The people of Switzerland speak three separate languages. The people of Belgium speak two distinct languages. There are millions of Americans in the United

States who are most at home in the use of some language other than English. There are a score of nations, all of which speak Spanish, and in each of which may be found quite distinct culture groups.

A little factual observation shows that race, culture, nationality, and language are not the same thing. Yet one of the most prevalent faults in discussion of races is the confusion that exists among these concepts—exemplified in such common terms as the "French race," the "Irish race," the "Mohammedan races," the "Semitic race," etc. The confusions may be illustrated by asking and answering the question: Who are the Spanish people? The answer could be, and correctly, that they are the nationals of the Spanish nation, including Nordic, Alpine, and, mainly, Mediterranean varieties of the Caucasoid race, as well as many who are predominantly Negroid. Or one might answer, all those who share in Spanish culture, including, as well as the people of Spain, many of those of North Africa, most of those in Latin America, and some peoples of the Pacific Islands, including people of all major racial groups and a dozen sub-races. A third answer might be: Spanish people are those who speak and are most at home in the use of the Spanish language. In that case, lines would be differently drawn, for many who do not share the general Spanish cultural heritage—as some Indian groups of Latin America and many Filipinos—have learned to speak Spanish. At the same time other groups that have absorbed many elements of Spanish culture speak other languages.

The term "race" is distinctive in that it refers to physiological features transmitted by biological heredity, whereas culture, nationality, and language are matters of individual and group behavior, acquired through social heredity, conditioning, and learning processes independently of biological hereditary processes. Unless this basic distinction is kept clearly in mind, thinking about race relations and race problems is certain to be confused, and inferences, misleading.

Race and Ethnic Relations

There is no necessary pattern to which race and ethnic groups conform in their relations to each other. Such relationships may be characterized by rapid assimilation, friendliness, and tolerance; or they may be hostile and intolerant, with complete assimilation impossible. Once a pattern of relationships between two groups, racially or ethnically different, has been established, it need not remain the same, but may change as conditions change. Usually any change in an existing pattern, especially if caste or class status is involved, is strongly resisted. Some phases of the long history of such relationships in the history of the United States illustrate these points.

The American Indian. From the first European invasions of North America, there was contact between different racial groups, the Caucasoid and the Indians, and, on both sides a number of different cultures. At first the relationship was characterized mainly by mutual tolerance and some degree of accommodation, but soon, through basic misunderstandings, conflicts arose. As the Europeans pushed in from the Atlantic coast and northward from Mexico, the conflict increased until it became an intermittent warfare. The prevailing attitude among the descendants of the Europeans became characterized by the widely held belief, especially along the frontiers, that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian." Some Indians became acculturated and assimilated into the dominant group. There was limited intermarriage. Competition for land between the racial groups was strong, and eventually the Indians who had not become assimilated were confined to reservations on land of little value, where they are now. The Indians, from a population which probably was several million when the Europeans arrived, declined numerically until they were generally looked upon as a vanishing race. Recently, under custodial care of the Federal government, as previously noted, their population has begun to climb until it is now about 400,000. With the end of competition for land, the prevailing attitude toward the Indian has reverted to one of tolerance strongly tinged with romanticism. This illustrates a cycle of race and ethnic relations which began with tolerance, became extremely hostile, and has again become tolerant.

West Coast Chinese. A similar cycle has marked the history of relations between the Caucasoids of the American west coast with the Chinese immigrants and their descendants. The first Chinese were brought into California at the time of the gold rush, when there was an extreme shortage of menial and domestic labor. Despite racial and ethnic differences, the Chinese were warmly welcomed because they filled a need in the frontier economy. Later, the elements of land and job competition brought strains in the relations of the different groups, then open conflict, resulting in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. The Chinese have, as a policy, avoided as much as possible direct competition with the dominant group, with the result of a decline in conflict and a return of tolerance. During the Second World War this tolerance became greatly augmented by the common cause of China and the United States against Japan.

The American Negro. The story of the American Negro is quite different. A long history of slave status of the Negroes and their great numbers have prevented general development of tolerance toward them. Brought to this country as slaves, the Negroes fitted into a ready-made

and enforced system; but their numbers increased so rapidly that they became a source of fear in the dominant racial group, especially in the South. At the time of the American Revolution, one-fifth of the population of the colonies was Negro, and there were strong movements to put an end to slavery and the importation of more Negroes. The expansion of the colonies and the resultant need for labor kept the institution alive, however, until the Proclamation of Emancipation in the Civil War years. The numbers of Negroes continued to grow, but less rapidly than the remainder of the population, until at present only one-tenth of the population of the United States is Negro.

The freeing of the Negroes from slavery broke up the accommodations of the slavery system, and there followed many years of strained and hostile race relations in the southern states. The Negroes became actual and potential competitors for land and work. The eventual result was a virtual caste system characterized by segregation and discrimination which, in many ways, resembled the old system of slavery. Other forces made the new arrangement inadequate in time. The rural Negroes began to migrate in large numbers to urban centers and the North where they found a wider range of occupational opportunities. At the same time education and experience in organization were producing a new and intelligent leadership among Negroes. Their participation in the First and Second World Wars and political balance of power in some of the large northern cities were additional changes which have made the post-Civil War adjustment patterns inadequate. At present new accommodations are in the process of working themselves out in a variety of situations—North, South, and West, urban and rural. This groping toward new adjustments has resulted in many local problems, conflicts, and, on occasion, violence. As yet there are few indications of a decline in intolerance; and, where competition in various activities becomes more intense, it is usually accompanied by a rise of hostile prejudice.

European Immigrants. A long history of ethnic group relations, not complicated by racial differences, is found in the large European immigration into the United States, especially before the adoption of quota controls over its volume and make-up. There were two well-marked periods in this immigration—the old immigration until roughly 1880, and the new immigration after that approximate date. The old immigration had, predominantly, these characteristics: it was an immigration of Northern and Western Europeans whose cultures closely resembled, in their main features, the dominant culture of the American people; it was an influx of families; the new arrivals found a rapidly expanding economy and large areas of good free land so that often the new immigrants were welcome as needed farm labor and farmers, rather than as

competitors. The result was a high degree of tolerance among the various ethnic groups, with only occasional localized conflict. The new immigration increasingly displayed contrasting characteristics. They came chiefly from Southern and Eastern Europe and had ways of life that differed more from those of the people already here. They included large proportions of young, unattached males whose avowed purpose was to make a fortune and return to their homelands. They also found an expanding economy, but one less able to absorb them without competitive conflict, and there remained little good, cheap land so that their adjustments had to be made, for the most part, in large industrial cities. The ethnic conflicts, with their intolerances were much sharper for new immigrants than for the old, and opposition to them eventually brought enactment in 1924 of the quota control laws, greatly reducing the influx.

The Assimilative Process

Several terms are important in discussion of the adjustment process where racial and ethnic groups are in contact. *Assimilation* refers to the entire course through which two unlike groups, racially or ethnically, become, in effect, one group, mainly by absorption of the smaller into the larger group. In the history of European immigration into the United States the assimilation process has, most typically, involved three generations. The "first generation" immigrant includes adults coming from other cultures, who have become so habituated in the foreign culture that they cannot completely change their ways. The "second generation" is small children coming with these adults, and children born in the receiving country to immigrant parents. These children have been, typically, marginal persons—persons who live in two cultures at once but who cannot completely belong to either. These children live largely in the Old World culture at home; but at school, on the playground, in the street, and later in their jobs, they live mainly in the culture of the New World. This second generation has been a maladjusted and problem group in the American scene. By the time the second generation has produced children they are well adapted to the new culture, and the third generation, in most cases, has been completely assimilated.[4]

Typical stages in the assimilative process have included, usually in the order named, accommodation, naturalization, and amalgamation. Accommodation is the kind of essential adjustment of the new immigrants to the native culture necessary to live, hold a job, and carry on a few simple business transactions. Most immigrants, under force of need, make rapid accommodations. Naturalization is the formal legal process, requiring time and further conditioning and training in the ways of the re-

[4] Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America*, Prentice Hall, 1939.

ceiving country. Its end result is citizenship with legal status and acceptance, at least formally, into the national in-group. Amalgamation refers to intermarriage between the descendants of aliens and natives, the ultimate mark of acceptance and tolerance, marking more realistic status as an equal in the dominant culture. Usually amalgamation marks the practical completion of assimilation.

Aids to Assimilation. The greatest aid to speedy and complete assimilation has been the economic opportunities which have gone with it. Unassimilated ethnic groups invariably find limitations upon their efforts to better themselves and encounter obstacles in job or business competition. In addition the American people, officially and otherwise, have encouraged and helped immigrants to become Americanized as a matter of policy. Most national groups which have been largely represented in our population have maintained their own organized aids for new arrivals from their home countries to speed assimilation. Also, especially in large cities, partisan political organizations desiring additional votes have often helped to speed assimilation, at least to the point of qualifying new arrivals to vote.

Obstacles to Assimilation. Intolerance based on racial myths and confusions, fear of competition, and spatial isolation have served in many cases to retard or halt the assimilation of groups. This has been mainly true where obvious racial characteristics enter into the situation. The "color line," in some states drawn by law, and in all supported by strong mores and traditions, prevents intermarriage on any considerable scale between racial groups, thus barring complete assimilation and perpetuating group differences. Naturalization is forbidden in the case of some groups; and laws forbidding aliens to own certain types of property may limit complete assimilation. Usually, where complete assimilation is not permitted by the dominant group, strong class lines are drawn between racial and ethnic groups, which tend to keep the minority groups in poverty and to further hinder complete absorption into the prevailing culture. This has notably been the case with the American Negro and Orientals.

Summary

The problems of race and ethnic relations have been so treated as to emphasize the force of myths and beliefs unsupported by, and even contrary to, facts in shaping human attitudes and guiding behavior. The widely held ideas regarding the innate qualities of races which support notions that some races are superior and others inferior represent one

expression of the basic in-group versus out-group structure of human societies which, in one form or another, is found everywhere. Although myths and unfounded beliefs have received special emphasis in this chapter, it may be noted that they enter as a factor in all social problems and have surprising persistence even in the face of developing scientific knowledge.

Race and ethnic relations do not conform to any particular pattern, but change as conditions change. In our own national history of the repeated contacts of alien groups, attitudes have ranged from those of complete tolerance and cooperation to extreme intolerance, conflict, and violence, usually depending upon the extent and degree of competition among groups for land and jobs. The problems of alien ethnic groups in our country, where actual race difference does not enter as a complicating feature, have tended to solve themselves in the assimilative process through which foreign people have lost their cultural distinctions to become identified in the larger, dominant group. Where race has been a factor, however, assimilation has been incomplete because of the strong traditional "color line" which prevents amalgamation, as well as to other restrictive devices such as denial of citizenship or full participation in economic realms. In such cases the distinctions between racial groups tend to become fixed in our class structure.

There is considerable confusion in most discussion of race and ethnic relations because of failure to distinguish clearly between race and nationality, language, and other cultural characteristics. Race, properly, refers to physiological qualities transmitted by biological heredity. The other types of qualities such as nationality and language are matters of social, not biological, heredity and are acquired by individuals in their group associations.

Terms

Pseudoscientific
Negroid
Amerind
Nordic
Alpine
Mediterranean
Aryan
Assimilation
Accommodation
Amalgamation
Racism

Questions

1. Which are the major racial groupings of man? List several sub-races.
2. What are the monogenetic and polygenetic theories of racial origins?
3. What are commonplace confusions of the term "race"?
4. What is the significance of the "Aryan myth"?
5. What are the usual stages in the process of assimilation?
6. Describe some obstacles to assimilation.

READING LIST

Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics.* Modern Age, 1941.
C. S. Coon, *The Races of Europe.* The Macmillan Co., 1939.
A. deGobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races.* G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915.
Thomas Garth, *Race Psychology.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1931.
M. J. Herskovits, *The Myth of the Negro Past.* Harper & Bros., 1941.
O. Klineberg, *Race Differences.* Harper & Bros., 1935.
Ralph Linton (ed.), *Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940.
A. Locke and B. J. Sterne (eds.), *When Peoples Meet: A Study of Race and Culture Contacts.* Progressive Education Association, 1941.
Gunnar Myrdal, *et al., An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.* Harper & Bros., 1944.
H. W. Odum, *Race and Rumors of Race.* University of North Carolina Press, 1943.
Hortence Powdermaker, *After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South.* Viking Press, 1939.
E. B. Reuter, *Race Mixture.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1931.
Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America.* Prentice Hall, 1939.

CHAPTER VIII

Crime and Delinquency

A threat to individual and group welfare in every society arises from the deliberate violation of socially approved standards of conduct by individuals. When such violations constitute infractions of formal laws they are considered crimes, punishable by government; when on the part of juveniles, as delinquencies, they call for corrective measures. As in the case of race and ethnic group relations discussed in the previous chapter, popular attitudes, often based on myths and unfounded beliefs, are an important element in the problem—such as the widely held notion that criminality or a tendency toward criminal behavior is biologically inherited or otherwise has its roots in biological processes.

The nature of deviant behavior is clearly revealed in the study of crime and delinquency as related to ethnic and racial groups in this country. The Negro, for example, is shown by statistics to have higher crime rates than the dominant Caucasoid group. With law making and law enforcement almost entirely in the hands of the "whites," and the general conflict situation existing in relations between the groups, it can easily be seen that Negroes are more apt to be suspected, arrested, and convicted, thus appearing more often in statistics, than are "whites," without there necessarily being any essential differences in their actual behavior. The same could easily apply to members of alien culture groups to whom, often, particular traits of criminality are ascribed.[1]

In the case of second generation immigrants, or marginal persons, rates of criminality and delinquency appear to be especially high. These persons, as noted in the previous chapter, typically live in two cultures and are not fully a part of either one. Apart from the disrupting personality effects of such a situation, it seems inevitable that there would arise conflicts between standards of behavior and attitudes of the disparate cultures. Where such conflicts arise they would tend to throw into doubt the rules and values of either or both cultures and bring about criminality and delinquency.[2]

---

1 Donald R. Taft, "Nationality and Crime," *American Sociological Review*, October, 1936, p. 725.

2 *Immigration and Crime*, Sixty-first Congress, Senate Document No. 750.

Roots of Crime. From what has been said it would seem that crime and delinquency can be understood, in part, at least, in terms of attitudes of the dominant group and in terms of conflicts in standards impinging upon individuals. In other words, the understanding of deviant behavior lies in cultural and social phenomena characterizing individual and group relations. Alternative theories, such as that criminality is hereditary or represents atavistic returns to primitive impulses, have had, and continue to have, wide credence; but valid evidence to support them is lacking.

The relation of crime to culture setting is well illustrated in the apparent rapid growth of "white collar" crime in this country. As various students have recently pointed out there is probably much more of this class of criminality than is evident from statistics. "White collar" crimes usually involve dishonest financial manipulations in which middle and upper class persons in clerical and desk jobs are most apt to engage. Quite probably a large proportion of the offenses in this category remain undetected or are not prosecuted, which accounts for their not being included in most statistics of crime. Such criminality clearly reflects the cultural pressures of a highly competitive society which measures things in money terms and ascribes social status on the basis of income and wealth.

The Study of Crime

Crime has been a subject for systematic study for nearly a century and, as in the case of much of the study of social phenomena, has passed through several stages. In its early phases it was mainly a matter of setting up erroneous and oversimplified theories supported by uncritical casual observation. A second phase was a negative one, in which these earlier observations were submitted to critical re-examination and discarded as contrary to fact, or as inadequate. The third stage was the construction of more adequate, but complex theories based upon a large number of careful observations more in keeping with scientific standards.

Early Theories. One type of theory which was accepted, and which, despite obvious weaknesses, is still widely held in some form, is that which was advanced in the late nineteenth century by the Italian criminologist, Cesare Lombroso. It was the notion that criminals are a physiological type that can be distinguished by stature, length of arms, facial angle, size and shape of ears, etc. In this theory criminals look, in general, somewhat like apes, and represent a throwback through the hereditary process to early human or pre-human types. Criminal behavior is explained as a reversion to attitudes and behavior of the human "savage" ancestry. In cartoons and often on the stage and screen, the criminal is

depicted in such a manner, and most persons who think they can tell a criminal on sight accept some version of the Lombrosian idea. The fact, easily checked by observation, is that known criminals are of all physiological types and, as a group, are indistinguishable from a random sampling of noncriminals.[3]

A type of theory which later had great prestige, generally credited to the French jurist and sociologist, Gabriel Tarde, is that crime could be accounted for in terms of imitation. In this theory, law-abiding people are those who associate with and imitate the ways of other law-abiding people, whereas criminals are those who associate with and imitate criminals. Observations since Tarde have tended to confirm the importance of differential association in explaining crime, and that imitation has some part in the development of criminal habits; but they also have shown that a simple mechanistic notion of the imitative process is inadequate as a complete explanation of crime.[4]

With the development of techniques for measurement of intelligence at the turn of the century there arose a type of theory that attempted to account for criminal behavior in terms of retarded mental development or insanity. For a time such notions were widely accepted; but more recently criminologists have recognized that feeble-mindedness and insanity enter as factors in some crimes, but they do not constitute the only, or even major, causes of crime and delinquency.

Current Theory. Current criminological theory tends to minimize such factors as have been discussed except that of imitation, and to look for causes of crime in the organization and processes of society. They assume that habits of behavior, attitudes, and personality traits are formed in maturing individuals mainly as responses to associations with other persons. Social experience is characterized by pressures to bring about conforming or deviant behavior, and attitudes which are compatible with and conducive to such behavior. In some societies the standards of behavior are quite uniform and are consistent with culturally acceptable life-goals. In others, they are inconsistent and conflicting, and often frustrate individuals in attempting to reach life-goals. Under the latter conditions many persons may develop attitudes and habits leading to behavior which the group does not tolerate; whereas in more consistent social systems there is relatively little criminal behavior. In a society such as ours which places high value on monetary success on the one

[3] Charles Goring, *The English Convict.* His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, Abridged Edition, 1919.

[4] R. T. LaPiere and Paul Farnsworth, *Social Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936, p. 124.

hand, and on strict honesty on the other—when conflicts arise between the values, some will prefer to remain honest; others, to be "successful," even at the price of dishonest behavior. It is here that differential association enters, because usually those individuals who have matured and live among people who prefer honesty will be habituated to make that choice. Those whose personalities have been shaped largely in association with others who emphasize the importance of success at any price will be more apt to choose otherwise.

Methods of Studying Crime. A number of methods are used in the study of crime, both singly and in combination. The principal one is statistical, which has several advantages in that it permits inclusion of a vast amount of factual material and tends to eliminate personal feelings. Statistics, however, have limitations in that many of the subtler but highly significant facts about crime do not readily reduce to numbers.

A second method is ecological, which relates the place of residence of criminals and place of commission of crimes to areas, from which relationships can be deduced the conditions that produce criminal behavior. A third method, closely related, is the crime survey, which is an intensive study of communities and neighborhoods with reference to prevalence or relative lack of criminality, trends in volume and kinds of crime, laws and law enforcement, general community attitudes toward crime, and the people who commit crimes.

Especially with the development of interest in the related problem of juvenile delinquency in the last two generations, more and more use has been made of case studies of individual delinquents and criminals, their families, and of gangs and other criminal organizations. These studies throw light on the step-by-step development of behavior habits and attitudes in maturing persons under the impact of life experiences and the influence of particular associations. A tangent development has been the use of the criminal's or delinquent's "own story," not only to get facts (often of doubtful validity) but primarily to get clues to the individual's attitudes toward his own situation and toward society.[5]

Statistics of Crime

No one knows with any degree of certainty how much crime or delinquency exists, either in the United States or in other countries, or in any community. The reasons are several. There is considerable laxity in many places in keeping records. The very nature of crime and delinquency is such that every effort is usually taken to conceal misdeeds and

[5] Clifford Shaw, *The Jackroller*, University of Chicago Press, 1930.

escape responsibility for them. Most perplexing is the legal definition of crime which maintains that a crime has not been established until it has been definitely proved to the satisfaction of a court of law. One cannot establish a crime by proof in court until someone has been accused, apprehended, and brought to trial. It is obvious that only a small proportion of criminal acts ever reach the stage of being proved in court. Statistics on "crimes known to the police" help to some extent, but they are limited and still give us an inadequate and incomplete picture. From the best statistics we have, the "crime bill" of the United States runs over ten billion dollars a year,[6] and several million Americans are or have been criminals, leaving out petty infractions of laws such as traffic violations.[7] The long term trend is a growth in crime rate in the nation despite continuous improvement in law enforcement personnel and techniques. In comparison with other countries, the United States has higher crime rates in most categories except ,that of "political crimes," which is a type that bulks large in some nations, such as Soviet Russia, but is negligible in the United States. Juvenile delinquency appears to be increasing in the United States despite a declining proportion of children in the population and supposedly better methods of prevention and treatment.[8]

In statistical comparisons, males commit many times more crimes and delinquencies than females. As among age groups, the great concentration of delinquency and crime is found among persons in late adolescence and early adulthood. The crime rate is greater for persons in lower socio-economic brackets than among the well-to-do. It is higher for those of "colored" races than for "whites." Native "white" Americans have higher crime rates than do first-generation immigrants when corrections are made for age and sex distributions of the two groups, but second-generation immigrants have higher rates of crime and delinquency than either. Urban areas have more crimes than rural areas, and large cities more than smaller ones. The crime rate is highest in urban areas, and in the transition zones bordering the central business districts, and is lowest in the suburbs.

All these and other statistics tend to relate crime to living conditions and to associational factors. The findings in other types of studies tend to bear out such relationships, although they do not answer the question of why, under the least favorable conditions, some turn to crime and delinquency but others do not. Such problems call for close study of the social psychology of the most intimate and formative associations, especially those that exist within the family.

---

6 John L. Gillin, *Criminology and Penology*, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1945, p. 31.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 22ff.

8 Harry E. Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology*, Prentice Hall, 1945, pp. 111ff.

The Family and Personality

Case studies of thousands of juvenile delinquents show the importance of the family in the formation of the personality of growing individuals. In our culture and others which resemble it, the infant and growing child are conditioned in basic attitudes and behavior patterns by other members of the immediate family, chiefly. For very young children the family *is* society, and there are few and very limited contacts outside it. The most satisfying and most frustrating of experiences are closely linked with other members of the family; and others in the family are the most available models to imitate as well as the source of suggestion and countless "do's" and "don't's." These early impressions are never entirely escaped as one reaches adulthood. Nor are such impressions and early experiences precisely the same for any two children, even in the same family.

Sociologists and social psychologists, following Charles Horton Cooley, use the term primary group to emphasize the primacy of intimate, face-to-face groups of which the immediate family is most typical. Other intimate groups important in early formative years are the childhood play group and the boyhood gang. Both are capable of exerting great influence on the habits and standards of growing children, and quite usually their codes of behavior are somewhat in conflict with those of family and home. So true is this of our own culture that children almost universally encounter cultural inconsistencies very early in life and continue to encounter them throughout life.

If one relates family life and play groups to various neighborhoods, urban and rural; to the different socio-economic levels; and to the racial and ethnic groups, the general picture of criminality becomes a coherent and significant one, for wherever conditions are least favorable to a consistent and harmonious family and play life, the rates of delinquency and crime are apt to be highest.

Other Factors in Crime

What has been said applies mainly to the habitual and professional criminal, whose activities are consistent with his attitudes and habits. The analysis of crime and delinquency would not be complete, however, without some notice of the occasional criminal whose infraction of the law is quite inconsistent with his usual modes of behavior and contrary to his own convictions. Such persons may act on impulse, out of desperation, or under the pressure of extreme circumstances. Such crimes are highly dramatic, but constitute a relatively small and unimportant part of the crime problem, even though they may present serious problems of personal maladjustment. Such crimes may, and do, occur in any group; but they are more likely to occur where status competition is keenest, com-

pulsions to succeed are greatest, and opportunities for succeeding and gaining status are limited for large numbers of individuals.

Those who commit "fortuitous" crimes and delinquencies are characterized by remorse and usually may be readily reformed by intelligent and sympathetic measures. However, the social stigma attached to such persons may well constitute an effective bar to a satisfying social readjustment and force such individuals into associations and circumstances where pressures to further criminal acts are too great to withstand.

Alcoholism, Drug Addiction, and Crime. Such other social and personal problems as alcoholism and drug addiction are closely, but not invariably, associated with criminality. There are several factors in this complex interrelationship. It is true that the excessive use of drugs and alcohol tends to blur judgment and lessen inhibitions, and thus contributes directly to criminality in some cases. It is also true that indulgence of such habits is costly and places pressure upon individuals to secure money by any means at hand. It is further probable that persons who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol are more apt to be detected and apprehended, and they meet with antagonistic prejudice which such addiction arouses. On the other hand, being under the influence of alcohol is considered a mitigating circumstance in some crimes of violence. Further, the traditions of the criminal world attach far less blame to the alcoholic and drug addict than do the general mores, and in some cases even give definite approval to such practices. This is illustrative of the confusion of cause and effect that is encountered in some areas of the crime problem and is indicative of similar confusions which may be encountered throughout the study of social problems.

The War on Crime. In modern complex societies the control of delinquency and more especially of crime is left to a group of specialists who include the police, prosecutors, and others who maintain some degree of morale and *esprit de corps* by conducting an intermittent "war" against crime. The effect of this war is to bring about in-group versus out-group relations in which organized criminals are looked upon as enemies and in turn look upon law enforcement agencies and their members as enemies. Young juvenile delinquents, who are in contact with other delinquents or with criminals, soon develop this in-group versus out-group point of view, as is attested by numerous case studies. This is the factor of great importance in delinquency and criminality, and it helps to explain much in the attitudes of both youthful and adult criminals. The codes of criminals and of many youthful gangs usually are built around high values placed upon loyalty and refusal to give information that would give "aid and comfort" to the enemy. High esteem and

status may be achieved in such circles by daring exploits against enforcement officials, to whom are attributed (as in in-group versus out-group relations everywhere) all kinds of mean and despicable attributes. This idea of hatred for the common "enemy" appears to flourish especially in reformatories and prisons whose inmates often become "hardened" criminals even though previously they had not been.[9]

Problems of Enforcement

The in-group versus out-group relationship which exists between enforcement personnel and criminals suggests one of a number of factors that hinder complete effectiveness of law enforcement. Another basic factor lies in the very philosophy of government found especially in the Anglo-Saxon tradition which strongly emphasizes the importance of the individual and surrounds him with strong legal protections. The criminal, up until the time of his conviction of a crime, finds at his disposal many protective devices, as he does to a lesser extent even after his conviction. At every point in the process of detection and arrest the enforcement officers are closely restricted in the extent to which they may invade the privacy of a suspected person to gain proof of guilt, and lacking such proof the individual is protected against false arrest. After arrest, the suspected person may employ competent counsel and demand that enforcement officers justify continued detention, and even then may insist upon release under reasonable bail. In court he may have, as a matter of right, a public jury trial, with lawyers to defend his cause until his guilt is established beyond a "reasonable doubt." If convicted he may, upon showing "errors" in his trial, seek a new trial or appeal to higher courts.

The entire system of safeguards tends to hinder and retard law enforcement and undoubtedly permits many criminals to escape paying the penalty for criminal acts. It also makes the whole operation of law enforcement selective. Those who are most clever, the best able to employ resourceful lawyers, and who have high status in the community and an impressive appearance before a jury usually have the better chance of escaping the legal process at each of many points. The net result is that the number of persons convicted and punished for crimes stands in relatively small proportion to the number of crimes known to the police; and those who eventually make up our prison population are not a representative cross-section of the criminal population.

Retarding Factors. Two other factors tend to retard enforcement. One lies in the multiplicity of laws under which we live. Each meeting of a

[9] Clifford Shaw, *op. cit.*

law making body, whether a city governing group, state legislature, or a congress, adds more laws to the thousands already existing; and rarely are laws repealed. So complex does the whole structure of formal restrictions become that complete enforcement is an impossibility, with the result that many laws are usually disregarded or enforced only in extreme cases. This leads to considerable variation from time to time and place to place in enforcement of laws and results in carelessness in observance of, and even contempt for, laws on the part of a great many persons.

Another factor which retards law enforcement lies in the nature of crime itself. Often a crime is defined as "an act" of a person or persons, but the actuality of what constitutes a crime is much more complex. There is no act that is criminal under all circumstances, nor are there many acts that may not be criminal under some circumstances. As important as the act itself is the social situation in which the act is committed. The judgment of any behavior is always in terms of its appropriateness, as defined by law or custom, to a particular set of circumstances. Thus to shoot a man in cold blood under some circumstances is the most serious of all crimes; under others it may make the shooter a public hero. To take the property of another by force or stealth may constitute a crime, or, under some circumstances, may be demanded of the perpetrator in the line of his duty as an officer of the law, such as the seizure of equipment used for gambling when gambling is forbidden by law. So complex are these situational elements that almost always "mitigating circumstances" must be considered in determining guilt or degree of guilt of persons accused of crimes.

Problems of Punishment

How to punish persons convicted of crime or, in the case of juveniles, of delinquencies presents one of the most difficult questions in connection with law enforcement. Punishment must serve several purposes. It must be a substitute for private revenge by injured parties. It must maintain morale among law-abiding citizens. It must set examples so that persons who are tempted to break laws will fear the consequences. It must protect the community by, at least temporarily, incapacitating criminally inclined persons. And it must reform those who are punished if they are, sooner or later, to return to normal life activities. Often, too, the punished persons stand in need of occupational rehabilitation to enable them in time to live honestly in society. All of these purposes cannot be served equally well, and they may stand in opposition to each other. The notions of what punishment must be to satisfy the desire for revenge and yet act as a deterrent to further crime usually seriously interfere with

programs aimed at reform and rehabilitation. The most advanced prisons attempt to emphasize the latter objectives.

Failure of Punishment. The crux of the problem of punishment lies in the fact that in our culture, and others similar to it, well over 90 per cent of the persons who are punished for crimes are returned to the community. If they return worse for their experience, the punishment has increased the crime problem. There is general agreement among criminologists that our system of punishment tends, in its totality, to increase criminality by producing, largely through prison experiences and associations, more and more hardened criminals. That there is a similar popular belief is witnessed by the stigma that attaches to former convicts and prison inmates, leading to discriminations which often make it almost impossible for such persons to make a reasonable adjustment to law-abiding life ways.

Trends in Punishment. There has been, in our culture, a consistent long-range trend away from cruel and physical punishment and toward more humane surroundings and treatment for those who have been convicted of delinquencies and crimes. This has placed increasing emphasis upon imprisonment as a mode of reform and rehabilitation and has led to the development of an experimental sub-science of penology. The difficulties of reform by imprisonment and the almost universal overcrowding of prison facilities has, in turn, led to increased use of substitutes for imprisonment. For criminals, one of the chief of these has been the increased use of fines as punishment, but there is obvious injustice involved in the use of fines. For one criminal a fine of $10,000 may be but a slight inconvenience; whereas for another a fine of $100 may be a crushing burden for the guilty person and the innocent members of his family. Especially for juvenile delinquents, but also to a lesser extent for criminals, probation, or conditional release under supervision, has long been gaining in favor. A companion measure is parole, or conditional release before the expiration of a prison sentence. The theoretical justification of these practices has been that persons may be re-fitted into the community under conditions conducive to normal living much better than under the highly artificial atmosphere of prisons. Regardless of how sound the theory, success of probation and parole are largely dependent upon the skill and adequacy of supervision, and almost invariably there are too few skilled persons to properly carry out the programs. Both parole and probation are subject to constant public criticism because they fail to incapacitate the offender and thus give protection to law-abiding persons. They also fail to give to aggrieved parties a satisfactory substitute for private revenge.

The Economics of Crime

What has been said has emphasized principally the political science (law enforcement), the sociological (differential association), and the social psychological phases of the crime problem. The economic phases present some significant questions and paradoxes. In most discussions of the crime problem emphasis is placed upon the "cost" of crime. Since similar emphasis often is placed in discussions of other social problems, it might be well to analyze this aspect of crime, because such analysis is more or less pertinent to the whole problem approach to social sciences.

The total "crime bill" in the United States is variously estimated at from five to fifteen or more billion dollars a year. A considerable variety of items are included in such estimates. There is the cost in property destroyed, in belongings and money which change hands, and in insurance carried as protection against crime. On the other hand, there are the costs which must be borne by taxpayers in building, maintaining and manning prisons and jails, the costs of courts, and costs of police of various types with their increasingly expensive equipment. There are physical costs such as are involved in alarm systems, fences, and special building devices used to prevent theft and destruction. All these and other items may be considered as the economic "cost" of crime, but the assumption that they constitute a proportionate economic burden to society is highly misleading. The largest of the "cost" items is not money removed from circulation in our economic system, but money put into circulation. The sums spent in paying enforcement officials, guards, and others, made necessary by crime, are spent upon employment, and the effects upon our society are the same as from other kinds of employment-money spent to stimulate trade and production of goods and services. Money which goes into construction and maintenance of jails and prisons is a part of the general construction enterprise of our economy. Money taken from others through criminal activity is seldom hoarded, but rather rapidly finds its way into trade channels. These obvious facts are not stated in mitigation of criminality but to correct in part a common misunderstanding of the crime problem and to point up a basic and complicating fact—that crime is an integral part of our economic system. It is true that for many individuals crime constitutes an occasional heavy financial loss. It is equally true that many other individuals, even in such legitimate occupations as law enforcement, gain their livings from the existence of crime. It is a paradox of our economy that the more the losses sustained from criminal behavior, the more people there are in legitimate callings who gain their livelihoods wholly or in part from law enforcement, or some aspect of the efforts to control crime. So complex is the problem that it is impossible to say,

from the purely economic point of view, whether our society would be more or less prosperous if there were no crime, or very much less crime.

Some theories of crime stress economic motivation as a basic cause of criminal behavior, and it is true that a very large part of it, especially that which results in arrests and convictions, may be classed as economic. Too much emphasis upon economic motivation, however, leads into a particularistic oversimplification and therefore hinders, rather than helps, understanding of crime and delinquency. It has already been noted that early training, attitudes, loyalties, associates, and other factors, many of which have relatively little economic calculation in them, must be taken into consideration and given due weight. Although those in obvious economic need have relatively high apparent crime rates, this fact must be interpreted in the light of what has been said about the highly selective nature of the law enforcement process which tends to make those of little means more liable to detection, arrest, and imprisonment.

Panaceas for Crime and Delinquency

The study of all social problems involves a necessary examination of panaceas, or supposed relatively simple cure-all programs. Nowhere are such panaceas a more significant element of the problem than in connection with crime and delinquency. Three types of panacea are currently advanced, although still others might be included in a list. Each is held by its advocates to be the key to the elimination or marked reduction of unlawful behavior, and each has the common basic weakness that it is based upon a lack of comprehension of the complex nature of the problem. There runs through the reasoning underlying such programs the assumption common to popular and superficial political theory—that the people of every community are classifiable into two clear-cut categories: the bad and the good. The good are supposedly uniformly enlightened persons greatly concerned with good government, abstract justice, and fair play; whereas the bad are, through lack of enlightenment or inherent wickedness, opposed to these same things. Any careful consideration of such an assumption leads to realization that people differ, not as black from white, but in degree and most are somewhat inconsistent in themselves where such considerations are concerned. Nor does the degree of concern for any of these abstract ideals lead necessarily to criminal or law-abiding behavior. Nevertheless much discussion of crime and delinquency is based upon this unrealistic fallacy.

Education. Perhaps the leading panacea for crime and delinquency presents "education" as the necessary ultimate answer to the problem. As

appealing as such an implied program may be, it lacks factual support. Nations with high rates of literacy and general educational attainment may have high crime and delinquency rates. Individuals who are recognized as well educated are convicted of crimes. Historically, as in our group, as a people emerges from crude and restricted educational programs to universal and expanding school and college opportunities, the crime rate does not necessarily decline, but may rise. Education as a part of the reformation and rehabilitation of offenders has yet to show any such sweeping constructive results as are promised by a supposed panacea.

Rigid Law Enforcement. Next to education as *the* solution to the crime problem come proposals for more rigid enforcement of laws. Although increased control over criminal behavior by stricter enforcement is possible in most communities, several complications enter into such programs. On the other hand, a general application of the idea would mean larger prison populations, which in time, if past experience may be relied upon, would tend to return to the community more ex-convicts, many as hardened criminals. Present overcrowding of jails and prisons forces many enforcement officers, who are otherwise inclined, to be lax in prosecutions for some types of law infractions.

Even more basic is the problem of rigid enforcement in a culture which greatly emphasizes individual rights and protection for individuals in those rights. Necessarily, much of the detection, apprehension, and trials of individuals must be done upon a supposition of guilt in the absence of positive and final proof. No matter how strong the suspicion, it entails dangers of invasion of the privacy and "rights" of innocent persons. Where, as in police states, little regard is given to the protection of individual rights, under efficient police work ordinary crime rates fall (as in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany), but a problem remains. The decline in crimes, as we think of them in our culture, is offset by a rise in arrests and convictions for "political" crimes, so that the total rate of criminality remains high.

Eugenic Programs. One of the panaceas for crime and delinquency that has relatively little general support but strong pseudoscientific arguments is found in eugenic programs. The basic notion is akin to the Lombrosian and similar theories—that likelihood to criminal behavior is closely linked with biologically hereditary characteristics. Such notions have gained some formal support in the laws of some nations and states, permitting sterilization of some criminals. The programs based upon eugenics call for much wider application of sterilization practices as a necessary means

of reducing the proportion of criminal "types" in the population. The supporters of such a program are in direct opposition to prevailing scientific theory which, on ample evidence, ascribes criminal behavior to acquired traits and social influences which operate on persons regardless of their physiological equipment. At any rate, even where eugenic laws are in effect, they are sparingly used because of widely held and grave doubts as to their effectiveness in meeting the general problems of crime and delinquency.

Crime and Other Social Problems

Crime and delinquency have obvious and complex relations to the social problems already treated and to others yet to be discussed. In time of war the males of the age groups most active in criminal and delinquent pursuits are largely drawn into the armed services and other war activities. There is increased unity throughout the warring population and greater regimentation of people's activities. These factors make for decline in usual types of criminality. On the other hand, law enforcement personnel is weakened and many new legal restrictions invite new and widespread infractions of law, as illustrated by the rise of black markets and evasions of military drafts. Abnormal life conditions, the weakening of home controls, and other factors contribute to increased juvenile delinquency and to such problems as sex offenses and prostitution. The usual methods of keeping crime statistics tend to break down and are often ill-adapted to show changing trends, so that the measurement of criminality in wartime is inadequate for comparison with crime in peacetime. The usual aftermath of war is a sharp increase in recorded criminality arising from a wide variety of causes, which range from restoration of recording methods to general irritation at continued, but seemingly no longer justified, wartime restrictions.

Relationships of crime and poverty have already been noted. Poverty often means living conditions which increase likelihood of development of criminal attitudes and habits. The poor have less chance to escape in the selective law enforcement process. Not previously noted, but obvious, are the contributions of crime to poverty through imprisonment of wage earners and financial burdens placed upon the families of prosecuted persons. The modes of living often characteristic of persons living outside the law, including the close association between criminality and alcoholism or drug addiction, are such as make for shiftlessness and improvidence. Records of past deinquencies and criminal behavior narrow and limit occupational opportunities to individuals and work to their disadvantage in competitive economic endeavors.

Also, as previously noted, relationships among racial and ethnic groups predispose marginal and disadvantaged persons to criminality and to likelihood to be suspected, apprehended, and convicted of crimes. Strained relations among such groups lead to particular types of crime, both in the support by dominant groups of discriminatory practices, such as depriving persons of their right to vote, and in crimes of violence, as those involved in lynching and rioting.

As will be noted later, crime arises from and causes family disorganization, may be an important factor in individual and group maladjustments, and is related to organized recreation. In fact, crime and delinquency illustrate the general principle of the interrelation of all social problems.

Summary

More than most social problems, crime and delinquency have been subjects of systematic study and experiment, and the results clearly reveal a number of things pertinent to all social problems. As treated in this chapter, the importance of understanding attitudes and habits in their relation to group life is emphasized principally. In connection with the particular problem under consideration the attitudes general to a culture toward criminals and delinquents are equally as significant as the deviant behavior and attitudes of the offenders; and the interplay of the opposed points of view, in giving rise to the "war" against crime, tends to make the problem more difficult of solution.

Attitudes and behavior characteristics are partly explained by differential associations of individuals and in part by the social experiences which mold personality, especially in early formative years. This focuses attention upon the immediate family and childhood play associations, or primary groups, which occupy a key place in determining such experiences. Throughout the study of crime and delinquency there is the complication arising from inconsistency and conflict in standards, which is especially revealed in connection with problems of law enforcement and the punishment of offenders. Such pressures arising in the culture standards of the group are reflected in the apparent rapid increase in "white collar" crimes in this country.

The very complexities of social problems give impetus to efforts to find simple, pat solutions. Such presumed solutions or panaceas abound in most popular discussions of crime and delinquency. The outstanding cure-alls advocated are commonplace in connection with all social ills—education, laws and law enforcement, and eugenics—none of which, under close examination or practical test, is adequate to solve the problem under consideration.

Terms

Deviant behavior
Atavistic
Crime
Misdemeanor
Delinquency
Differential association
Case study
Transition zone
Penology
Parole
Probation
Panacea
Bail
Sterilization
Eugenic
Regimentation

Questions

1. Technically, how does crime differ from juvenile delinquency?
2. What are the various purposes which punishment is supposed to serve?
3. What have been the main long-term trends in the treatment of criminals?
4. What significant differentials are found in crime rates as to age groups? As to sex? As to place of residence?
5. Why may the law enforcement process be considered as highly selective?
6. How are problems of crime and delinquency related to those of the family?

READING LIST

Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology.* Prentice Hall, 1943.
Sanford Bates, *Prisons and Beyond.* The Macmillan Co., 1937.
Edwin H. Borchard, *Convicting the Innocent.* Yale University Press, 1932.
Lowell J. Carr, *Delinquency Control.* Harper & Bros., 1941.
John L. Gillin, *Criminology and Penology.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1945.
Seldon Glueck and Eleanor Glueck, *Criminal Careers in Retrospect.* Commonwealth Fund, 1943.
Raymond Moley, *Politics and Criminal Prosecution.* Milton, Balch & Co., 1929.
Roscoe Pound, *Criminal Justice in America.* Henry Holt & Co., 1930.
George Rusche and Otto Kirkheimer, *Punishment and the Social Structure.* Columbia University Press, 1939.
J. Thorsten Sellin, *Pioneering in Penology.* University of Pennsylvania, 1944.
Reginald H. Smith, *Justice and the Poor.* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919.
Edwin H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology.* Fourth Edition, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947.

CHAPTER IX

The Changing Family

The preceding chapter has indicated the importance of the family as a primary group in the formation of the personality—behavior traits and attitudes—of group members. The family in the modern world, and especially in our own culture, is itself the focal point for a number of social problems. Undoubtedly, there have always been family problems, but the nature of those currently of concern to social scientists are developments of our own times, and, like the problems of modern warfare, clearly illustrate the need for change on the one hand, and resistance to change on the other.

The problems of the modern family are indicated by evidences of disorganization so widespread as to affect adversely large numbers of individuals and, in the thinking of most students in the field, to constitute a threat to group welfare. These evidences of disorganization include rising divorce rates, increases in the number of "broken homes" or incomplete families, failures of families in child training functions, loss of security for the aged, and domestic discord. All of these indices are subject to short-run variations as they are reflected in statistics, but they also are aspects of long-range trends that can be understood only in historical perspective. The family is clearly institutional in nature, and, what is true of the changing family is, in varying extents, true of all other phases of the institutional structure of society in periods of rapid change.

The Family as an Institution

The family can best be understood as an institution, the most typical parts of which are found in every culture, but none of these parts is necessarily found in any one culture. Among these institutional parts are those by which pairs or groups of opposite sex are selected for more or less permanent mating unions, such as courtship in our own culture; betrothal of the selected individuals; marriage, through some form of public recognition of the union; patterns of relationship, authority, and responsibility in the family group, especially those having to do with legitimacy and systematic care for children; bereavement, property

inheritance, and traditional attitudes toward members who have died; and formal modes of ending marriage ties.

The family is traditionally the most generalized of all institutions in its functions; and in many social systems it is basic to all other institutions. Although in many descriptions much emphasis is placed upon its function in regulating sex behavior or in rearing children, its other functions may be, in some cases, even more significant. For instance, the family institutions may be primarily a means of establishing alliances among dynasties, or in uniting and maintaining advantaged economic positions. Historically, in China, the strong family structure has been the principal political, economic, educational, and religious institution; and in our own culture at one time it functioned much more importantly than at present in these various fields.

The relationships formed in the family institution are relatively permanent and stable, and usually they involve an intimacy of association seldom found in other institutional relationships. These ties are, in most cases, the source of most individual security and provide the most effective basic social controls to bring about conforming behavior in the members of the family. In those societies where the family is central to social organization, each family group is a miniature society in which the patterns of adjustment to the larger society are acquired.

It follows from this brief description of the family institution that any widespread malfunctioning may be felt throughout the social structure. Such malfunctioning means insecurity for individuals, weakened social controls, and lack of adequate adjustment techniques in individuals. Since this is true, the proper functioning of family life and relationships cannot be left to chance or to individual whims entirely. In most societies there are the most rigid community controls of the family system, and the most highly esteemed mores are those directly related to the family. All this is a powerful element in making the forms of family organization highly resistant to change even when the conditions under which the family must function are radically altered.[1]

Contributions of Anthropology

From the anthropologists we have much interesting material derived from comparative study of the family institution among various primitive peoples. The universality of the institution, the similarities in form and function, and the wide variety in specific aspects of family organization are impressive. Primitive people for the most part live in relatively small and compact communities, and there is characteristically a close interrelationship in function between community and family to the

[1] B. J. Stern, *The Family, Past and Present,* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

extent that the two, at times, are almost indistinguishable. In some cases the family dominates, and the community is, in effect, an extension of the family. In others the community dominates and the family is a mechanism through which it carries out activities. Despite romantic stories to the contrary, courtship, as we know it in our culture, is rare in primitive groups. The mating of sexes is usually planned and executed by elders in the community who may or may not consult the principals. Often such matings are arranged when the principals are still small children, and in some cultures the boy and girl may be rigidly separated throughout adolescence so that they remain virtual strangers until after the marriage ceremonies.

Betrothal and Marriage. Among primitive peoples, betrothal involves barter or the elaborate exchange of gifts between the families concerned, and bridal dowries are of considerable importance. In many cases, a degree of sexual license is permitted among growing boys and girls until the near approach of the time for marriage, when taboos become operative. The forms of marriage vary from group to group and according to status within groups. Marriage is often monogamous, involving the mating of one man with one woman. In some groups polygamy is practiced, if not by all, then by those of high status. This may take the form of polygyny, or the mating of one man with several wives. In modified forms of polygyny the marriage itself may be monogamous but permit the husband to have one or more concubines in addition to a wife. A less frequent form of marriage is polyandry, under which one woman may marry several men, as, for instance, all the brothers in a given family. An even rarer form of union is group marriage, under which a group of related males marry a group of related women and all assume husband and wife relations toward all of the opposite sex. Debated among anthropologists is the question whether any groups openly sanction complete promiscuity among the sexes in lieu of any form of marriage. If such an institutional form does exist, it is exceedingly rare.[2]

Relationship Patterns. Marriages usually bring about clear-cut divisions of work, responsibility, and authority, the patterns varying widely from culture to culture. Prevailing, but not universal, is the subordination of the wife to husband. In Western Civilization marriages usually result in new households, but in most other cultures they bring slight modifications in existing families, as the husband goes to live with his wife's family, or the wife to live with the husband's. In either case, the newly married pair fit into a pre-existing pattern of authority, responsibility,

[2] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, 3 Vols., The Macmillan Co. (London), 1921.

and division of labor usually under dominance of the older people. The care for and training of children may fall primarily to the mother, the father, the grandparents, or brothers and sisters of the husband and wife, depending upon the cultural patterns. In some groups the responsibility for children after they are old enough to walk falls upon the whole community rather than upon particular families. Paternity and legitimacy of children may be carefully guarded, or disregarded, varying from group to group and among families of different status within groups. Many primitive groups practice widespread interchange of children through adoption customs. Children are usually highly prized, but there may be strong preference for males or for females under various cultural systems. In some primitive groups various types of birth control and infanticide are sanctioned to limit numbers, however.[3]

The customary relationships between husband and wife vary from those of utmost affection to those of strong antagonism. They may vary also from complete intimacy to quite formal associations. In most primitive groups there exists some form of divorce which may be at the option of the husband, the wife, or of both in mutual agreement. Bereavement customs for family members who die vary widely, usually impinging principally upon widows who, in extreme cases, must take their own lives as a demonstration of grief. Re-marriage, in case of bereavement or divorce, is usually provided for, especially in the case of young widows or widowers. Sometimes such re-marriage is automatic, as when the widow becomes, upon the death of her husband, the wife of one of his brothers.

The Extended Family. The family practices of primitives can only be understood if we keep in mind that the functioning family unit is usually much larger than that to which we are accustomed in our culture. Quite usually in the primitive household there are several generations of people—grandparents, parents, children, and other relatives. Under the usual high birth rates, there are many children of all ages, and, because of limited life expectancy, few old people. It is also a general rule of primitive life to recognize degree of blood and adoption relationships extending considerably beyond the household group as a functioning part of family organization. Throughout this extended family system there run definite reciprocal ties in which all members have duties toward, and expectations from, all other members.

In such extended families, the whole social universe of members may be within a family system, and contacts outside one's kin may be rare and exceptional. Thus the miniature society in which the individual grows to maturity remains the society in which he functions as an

[3] Margaret Mead, *From the South Seas,* William Morrow & Co., 1939.

adult. In such systems there is little chance for important cultural conflicts or for maladjustment in later years. In such systems veneration for the aged and ancestor worship are frequent and serve to solidify and perpetuate bonds and traditions.

Ethnocentrism and Marriage. Attitudes toward familial customs and traditions are universally ethnocentric. Each culture group looks upon its own particular patterns as natural and right, and upon contrasting practices and ideas as ridiculous or even indecent. This has been a point of extreme culture conflict as Europeans have come into contact with primitive peoples the world over, especially as regards control over sex conduct. Many primitives have ideas on sex relations both within and outside marriage which have horrified those accustomed to the rigid formal code of strict monogamy.

Under the pressure of European culture there have been observable long-term changes in other cultures. Monogamy, at least formally, has become almost universal, and extra-marital sex relations have come under almost universal formal taboos. There has been a concomitant decline in religious rites of primitives regarded as sexually indecent by European cultural standards. The Europeans and their descendants are characterized by extreme preoccupation with sex behavior and its relation to the family institution, when compared with other culture groups; and they have succeeded largely in stamping other peoples with whom they have been in contact with something of the same point of view.

From this brief, general anthropological survey we may get perspective for the consideration of our own family institutions and problems which center in it. It is to be noted that no one form of family life or practice is universal, but rather that a wide variety of types have existed and do exist. Many of the emphases we find in our own traditions stand in contrast to ideas found in other groups, but the influence of Western Civilization is affecting changes in family institutions throughout the world.

History of the Family

Recent history provides the setting for analysis of the modern American family and its adjustment problems. The family system and traditions of our culture were brought from Europe by colonists from various countries, but present fairly uniform characteristics. Most typically, it was an extended family unit with strong patriarchal controls and fairly complete subordination of women and children. It was a self-sufficient household unit with all who were physically able taking part in its productive enterprise, and little reliance, except for safety, on outside

resources. Marriage of all adult persons and the production and rearing of children were normal expectations, with exceptions rare. The family was the principal religious and educational institution and the source of nearly all social control. Those controls which came from outside served principally to reinforce the family controls.[4]

Many colonists in coming to America found effective ties with the extended family in the Old World broken; but the tradition was strong, and in a few generations the large family unit with reciprocal ties including those of various degrees of relationship had been effectively re-established in America. The long period of an open western frontier brought about a similar cycle, with individuals, couples, and small family units breaking from the larger unit, but in a few generations re-establishing the large, extended family unit in new areas of settlement.

The whole complex of trends in living conditions which accompanied the Industrial Revolution, however, served to break down traditions that had survived the great distances which separated colonists from home country and frontiers-people from the older, settled regions. To understand the effect of the Industrial Revolution it serves best to treat various aspects of its changes separately.

Changing Life Conditions. One of the most profound changes in American life was progressive and rapid urbanization. Throughout American history, the entire population has grown rapidly, but the urban population has grown more rapidly than the rural. At the beginning of our national life, 85 per cent or more of the population was rural, and the majority lived by agriculture. Now 60 per cent of the population is urban, and not more than one-fifth live by farming. Urbanization has brought a number of effects for family organization. As cities have grown larger, housing and other conditions have been less suited to large family units and to the rearing of children. Children, who on farms may help materially in the work and can be, at an early age, economic assets, contribute little to family support and become economic liabilities in cities. Even older persons may assist materially in an agricultural economy, whereas they tend increasingly to be burdens in urban settings.

Closely related to urbanization has been the historical rise in living standards and with it keener competition for socio-economic status. Both have been contributed to by an ever-increasing occupational specialization and an increase in mechanical aids to production. Work has increasingly been away from home in factory, store, or office, and the close associations within the family unit have given way to infrequent contacts among the mature members of the family. Under urban conditions it has become necessary to depend upon agencies outside the family

[4] W. Goodsell, *A History of Marriage and the Family,* The Macmillan Co., 1934.

to supply the needs and wants of family members. A phase of specialization has been the increased reliance upon specialized institutions by families for performance of functions which earlier had been mainly included in the family routine, such as education, religion, and recreation.

All of the changes in life conditions coming with urbanization and industrialization have made for smaller family and household units and increased proportions of childless marriages and single persons. They have also tended to take the chief interests of family members outside the home and family circles and to lessen the frequency of contacts among family members.

Changing Ideals. With the development of the American people there have been a number of changes in group ideals that have affected family organization and life. Most important has been increasing individualism that has tended to subordinate family solidarity to notions of individual rights. In the selection of mates for marriage, this has meant reliance upon individual choice by the principals instead of choices dominated by elders. A strongly romantic notion of marriage placed the basis of such choice upon more or less fortuitous "falling in love," with other factors becoming secondary. Each person, under this romantic ideology, is equipped "instinctively" to recognize his or her love object, and somehow, presumably, persons "meant for each other" manage to get together and become husband and wife. Interference by others with this semi-mystical process has become strongly tabooed.

Related ideals have to do with rise in status of women and children in and out of family relationships. This ideal, as it developed, stood in opposition to, and has largely displaced, the subordination of women and children to the male "head of the family." It has given rise to the equalitarian family, in which common decisions are reached by general discussion; and each member is largely guided by his own whims and notions. The changing status of women outside the home has opened educational and occupational opportunities, which has tended, increasingly, to make women economically independent of family ties.

The growth of scientific and pseudoscientific knowledge, with their encouragement of independent and critical thinking, has tended to weaken the hold of sex and other mores on large numbers of individuals, leading to a relative tolerance of modes of behavior once rigidly forbidden by marriage and family controls.

Legal Controls. With decreasing effectiveness of social controls within the family under urban life conditions there has been a parallel decline in informal community controls over family relationships. This has

been largely because the old closely-knit villages have been superseded by large, unstable communities in which most people are strangers and therefore indifferent to others. A result has been an increase in the number and variety of formal laws that attempt to govern family relationships and conduct and enforce responsibilities of family members. Because of the dominance of economic institutions, in our social structure most of these laws have to do with financial responsibilities and property ownership. Of recent years, however, they have gone into other phases of familial relationships, especially the parental obligations toward children. A culmination of legal controls is represented in the establishment of courts devoted to family controls and problems. Nearly all family laws are state laws, and as among the states of the United States they show wide variations, although general trends are toward more legal controls and more specialized governmental agencies to deal with family problems.[5]

The Negro Family

One phase of the history of American life conditions affecting the family is the special history of the American Negro family. During the slave trade, the pre-existing family relationships of Negroes were usually disregarded, and the establishment of new parmanent family ties was largely discouraged because conditions of the slave trade made it easier to deal with individuals than with closely knit kinship groups. There was systematic breeding of Negroes to produce more slaves, but it was under conditions that were not conducive to fixed attachments beyond what was necessary for the rearing of Negro children. Loose familial ties, especially between husband and wife, became a deeply fixed tradition. Even though, since emancipation, there has been increasing adherence to prevailing "white" mores, a change most marked in Negroes of higher socio-economic classes, the great mass of Negroes are still characterized by a loosely knit marriage and family institution.[6]

Historically there have been brought into the United States, by various culture groups, a wide variety of family systems with their traditions and beliefs; but all have tended, under strong pressures, to come into conformity with the dominant pattern. The Chinese introduced concubinage and other customs which have been effectively stamped out. Southern and Eastern Europeans have tried to perpetuate their elaborate extended family systems, but under life circumstances of urban America these have given way to more workable family structures—notably the small equalitarian family unit. In American life there may be many

[5] C. G. Vernier, *American Family Laws*, 5 Vols., Stanford University Press, 1931-38.

[6] E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States*, University of Chicago Press, 1939.

picturesque detailed variations of the dominant scheme, but there are few open, significant departures from the general family pattern.

The Family and Sex

One of the functions most emphasized in discussions of the modern American families is that of legitimatizing and controlling sex conduct. In our general cultural theory, only man and wife, living within the strict monogamous code, may, with social approval, have sexual intimacies. All sexual intercourse outside this framework is condemned by law and general group mores, and makes persons liable to severe penalties, not the least of which is loss of status. In application both the mores and laws are more severe when women violate the code than when men do. Only women are usually punished for prostitution, and almost invariably girls are the ones punished for sex offences. The loss of status for women involved in sex misconduct is radical and permanent, whereas for men it is less serious and usually temporary. This double standard of morality is quite generally recognized and accepted in our culture, but gradually, with the rise in status of women, the differential attitudes and resulting treatment of men and women is diminishing.

There is much misunderstanding of sex and its relation to human conduct and motives. Quite generally a basic sex "instinct" or "drive" is taken for granted, although just what is meant by such terms is extremely vague. Specific modes of sex conduct and the definition of situations calling for such conduct are cultural attributes learned by individuals, just as other types of conduct and understanding of the significance of situations are learned. The fact that in our culture open discussion of sex is discouraged in most circumstances has given a mystical air to sex and has greatly stimulated interest and curiosity in the subject.

The individual in our scheme first learns of sex as something evil and unclean when, as a small child, almost any act involving sex organs is forbidden, and infractions lead to reactions of horror on the part of elders. Later the individual learns to associate sex with all the delights of living and finds himself surrounded by glorification of sex—in motion pictures, on the stage, in story and song, in magazine advertisements, and on bill boards. He or she is inducted into the whole ideology of romance in which the central thought is that only in the mystical accident of falling in love does life have meaning or offer happiness. Later, from parents and in school, the individual receives some ideas of the physiology of sex—usually quite sketchy and somewhat inaccurate. This includes emphasis upon the dangers of venereal disease and other painful consequences associated with sexual behavior. Thus, upon reaching adult

hood, each individual has a conflicting group of strongly emotional attitudes drawing him or her toward sexual behavior, and still with dread and misgivings. It is seldom that husband and wife enter marriage with identical notions or feelings concerning sex.

The sex mores of married life are among the most sacred in our culture, and yet they are held up to constant criticism and ridicule. In some "emancipated" segments of our society marital infidelity is condoned, and in others it is deplored but accepted as a necessary evil. As in other phases of sex conduct a double standard of morality makes the penalties harder for women than for men, but here, too, following the general rise in status of women, there has been a tendency to permit them indiscretions on more or less the same basis.

Economics and the Family

In our economy—except among farm families—it is rare that the family is a unit for production of goods and services. If various members are employed it is in productive organizations unrelated to the family. Yet the family is highly significant to the economy as the principal unit of consumption. Family income is produced, typically, in a highly competitive and individualistic system of jobs and enterprises; and it is spent through a largely communal noncompetitive family budget. This lack of relationship between income and expenditure systems—between family earnings and family needs—is one of the contributing causes of poverty. The individual wage earner must care not only for himself, but must also supply the needs of all those directly dependent upon him, for which both law and mores hold him responsible. Those with large numbers of dependents are thus disadvantaged, other things being equal, by comparison with those who have few or no dependents.

The situations thus created bring about many sources of conflict. For reasons of prudence there is the tendency to have small families and few dependents, but mores of some institutions insist upon the ideal of large families. Practical considerations often lead to neglect of dependents, and especially of aged parents; whereas strong mores again emphasize obligations of caring for such persons. Individualistic ideas of private property within the family unit and individual rights to shares of family income are sources of a great deal of family discord—so much so that many observers of the family have fallen into the particularistic fallacy of ascribing all family discord to economic causes and motivations.

Security in the Family. Traditionally, in our culture, the individual has derived his economic security mainly from family membership, with the community and its agencies helping only when disaster makes such family

security inadequate. Changing conditions have, in many ways, militated to make the family basis of individual security less and less adequate. One factor has been rising standards of living, since what constitutes individual security is always relative to general living standards. When such standards are high it takes more and more command of goods and services to constitute security for each individual. At the same time it is quite commonplace for a number of individuals to depend upon the limited earnings of one person. This usually means that in time of crisis, as in case of serious illness, the family must increase its immediate resources through going heavily into debt, which further reduces the adequacy of future earnings. Governmental welfare agencies have been forced to take over, increasingly, the burden of individual economic security as the historical family system has failed more and more to provide adequately. Such change has been strongly resisted, and to accept charity or relief still carries with it a painful social stigma for members of families involved. Commercial insurance, which has developed into a major enterprise of our economy, meets many of the problems of inadequate family security but lies largely beyond the reach of those whose need in this regard is greatest.

The Social Security Act of 1935 marked the recognition of a need for a federalized program. This program, providing security for a relatively large proportion of the population, is still in the process of growth and expansion to cover the hazards confronting the individual in our society.

The Family and Child Raising

It is only through the family institution that our population can constantly reproduce itself and replace its mature social members. Thus the family must, through biological processes, produce children and insure survival of a considerable proportion to maturity, so that they in turn may reproduce. In a previous chapter it was noted that both the birth rate and death rate in our group have been dropping. A large part of the reduction in the death rate has been due to falling rates of infant mortality and childhood deaths. Thus, although fewer infants are born, more of those who are born survive to manhood and womanhood. Even then, the time is close at hand, according to students of population trends, when our population will become stationary, or even decline. This trend is reflected in increasing proportions of childless marriages and families with only one or two children.[7]

There has been relatively little concern over the declining size of families, but much more over the problems of the family in training chil-

[7] Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems*, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942, Chapter XVII.

dren for social membership. It has been a cultural assumption of our society that all men and women are fully qualified for parenthood with the responsibilities that are implied. Yet very few persons who become parents have had any specific training as preparation.

Successful parenthood, it would appear, requires an understanding of our complex society that is possessed by very few specialists. It would seem to call for an understanding of child psychology with all its subtle emotional implications such as is possessed only by a limited number ot persons in our group. It would call for a mastery of teaching techniques such as is found only in a relatively few professional teachers. Obviously the great majority of parents have little or no grasp of the tasks they must perform and are forced to rely upon folkways that contain much practical wisdom, but at the same time perpetuate many errors.

Many well-meaning parents find themselves in economic circumstances that make it impossible to give their children the customary "advantages" to equip them for full and useful social participation. When economic circumstances are better, parents often are so preoccupied with their complex relationships and activities in the larger community, necessary to achieving and maintaining status, that they have little time or patience for the exacting demands of successful child training. More and more the parental functions of preparing children for social membership is being transferred to institutions other than the family—the school and college, church organizations, "character-building" groups, and other public or semi-public agencies. A result of this transition has been an apparently high incidence of failure as measured by rising rates of juvenile delinquency and children with serious behavior and adjustment problems. It seems that, no matter how efficient, the impersonal agencies, such as schools, cannot adequately displace the intimate formative contacts of family life to develop well-rounded social members. The developing science of psychiatry has recently lent strong support to social scientists and others who, for many years, have been concerned with the apparently increasing failure of parenthood in our society.

The Family and Other Institutions

The family has been discussed in this chapter as a key institution which reveals sharply many of the problems of all institutions in modern rapidly-changing societies. It would be an error, however, to think of the family institution as separate and distinct from the whole complex of institutions, all so closely interrelated that what happens to each affects, to some extent, all others. Any changes in religious, educational, recreational, political, or economic institutions impinge upon the family of the same culture. The interrelationship of institutions in a culture

scheme is, at the same time, one of mutual support in which each supports all others, and one of competition in which some tend to develop at the expense of others. The family is strongly supported by church, state, the economy, and education, yet it must always compete with other institutions for influence over and control of its members. In rural communities one can still see conflict between home and school for control of children as schools attempt to lengthen the school term and increase the amount of time pupils spend in extracurricular activities. In the city the running competition between the influence of the job and demands of the family for the wage-earner's attention is obvious.

In our society the economic institutions have steadily gained ground in this interinstitutional competition, and thus increasingly have become the principal influence and control of individuals. This has not been a deliberately planned consequence, but rather the result of a great number of adjustments forced—usually against strong resistance—as life conditions have changed. This dominance of economic institutions is reflected in the extent to which economic ideals have taken their place as ideals of presumably noneconomic institutions. The ideal political institution is one which is economically sound. The ideal church keeps its budget in balance. The efficient school system is one which is adequately financed. The ideal family is a prosperous family.

In the interinstitutional competition the family has lost ground to most other institutions in our society. It is almost a rarity in our culture to find religious services in the home. Less and less do parents aid in the formal education of their children. Most of the economically productive functions have been taken from the home.

Summary

Institutions are, by their very nature, conservative and resistant to change. Nowhere is the plight of institutions in a period of rapidly changing life conditions better illustrated than by the family in our culture. Our strongest mores cluster about family life and relationships forbidding any considerable change in our family system. Despite these mores family life and organization have changed and are continuing to change with resultant serious social problems. Among these problems have been the general disintegration of families as reflected in rising rates of divorce and domestic discord; a decline in effectiveness of family controls over individuals; lessened individual security in family relationships; and a growing incidence of failure in training of children for mature social membership.

In institutional terms the situation may be described as one in which changed living conditions have placed the family institution at a dis-

advantage with other institutions in competition for control of individual members.

Terms

Social control
Extended family
Monogamy
Polygamy
Patriarchal
Legitimacy
Reciprocal
Ethnocentric
Taboo
Equalitarian
Particularistic fallacy

Questions

1. Why, specifically, has it been difficult to adjust a family institution that has been rural in origin to urban conditions?
2. How do family problems relate to those of crime and delinquency?
3. How do family problems relate to population problems?
4. What systematic training do most parents get for their job as parents? Why?
5. How have historical factors affected the Negro family institution?
6. Why do all peoples think their own family customs are the normal and natural?

READING LIST

E. W. Burgess and L. S. Cottrell, Jr., *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage.* Prentice Hall, 1939.
J. K. Folsom, *The Family and Democratic Society.* John Wiley & Sons, 1943.
E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States.* University of Chicago Press, 1939.
Earnest R. Groves, *The Family: Its Social Functions.* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1940.
Hornell Hart and Ella B. Hart, *Personality and the Family.* D. C. Heath & Co., 1941.
H. R. Mowrer, *Personality Adjustment and Domestic Discord.* American Book Co., 1935.
Meyer F. Nimkoff, *Marriage and the Family.* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
J. B. Stern, *The Family, Past and Present.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1947.
Willard Waller, *The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation.* The Cordon Co., 1938.
C. C. Zimmerman and M. E. Frampton, *Family and Society.* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1935.

CHAPTER X

Health and Social Problems

In a society dominated by economic institutions, all social problems tend to be expressed in economic terms. As has been noted in the discussion of the family and in the chapter on poverty, sickness and death hang as constant hazards over every family, and obviously constitute threats to its financial well-being. Although it can be foreseen with reasonably certainty that illness and death will occur in all families, the precise time and seriousness of such crises cannot, usually, be accurately forecast. Illness may be mild, involving little expense and no loss of earning power, or it may be prolonged, call for large outlays of money, and bring total loss of income for considerable periods of time.

Under earlier life conditions, when the family institution served adequately to give individuals security, relatively little was known of diseases. Most illness was treated by home remedies; physicians were few and were seldom called; the use of hospitals was resorted to only in extremities and by very few persons. True, the death rate was high and life expectancy, by present standards, was relatively brief. When productive workers were temporarily or permanently incapacitated, other members of the family shared a somewhat heavier burden until complete readjustment had been made. When death occurred, funerals and burials were simple and inexpensive.

Cost of Health. By contrast, at the present time the knowledge of disease has greatly increased, therapy has become effective and efficient, and contact with physicians, dentists, clinics, and hospitals are frequent experiences for almost all families. The market abounds with medical preparations and supplies for the home, some beneficial, many of doubtful value, and some quite harmful. All this has greatly increased the money outlay of families. Deaths are a less frequent family experience, but when they occur they are costly in funeral and other expenses.

The shifting of age groupings in our population because of greater life expectancy increases costs considerably. With fewer children and increased medical control over childhood diseases, what formerly constituted the major part of the problem—the health of the very young—

has declined in significance. But with people surviving to older ages, ailments peculiar to middle life and senility have increased. Such ailments as heart diseases, other organic failures, cancer, and psychoses usually call for long and expensive treatment and are apt, in part or completely, to incapacitate wage and salary earners.

Preventive Practices. One phase of increased understanding of disease has been emphasis upon preventive practices. Even when there is no illness or threat of illness, families, to an increasing extent, guard their diets, often by including more expensive goods, as witness the ever-growing consumption of dairy products. They give much more thought to rest, vacations, recreation, and preventive check-ups by dentists and doctors. Houses are carefully screened, and usually a large part of the expense in building dwellings goes into sanitary facilities. Increasing tax burdens derive from community safeguards to health, as sewer and water systems, and public health departments. All these are an important part of a higher standard of living and make greater the needs of each family to have a steady and adequate money income.

Despite all these precautions, and partly because of their expense, a large proportion of our population finds what are now considered adequate health safeguards beyond their reach. The largely unpredictable crises of illness and death finds many families unprepared economically to cope with them without resorting to debt and community aid in the form of relief or charity. The seriousness of the problem to the individual family is attested in the histories of most American families and is a matter of social concern. In the current widespread controversy over "socialized medicine" may be found clearly illustrated the recognized need for change and strong resistance to change—the elements of our basic formula for social problems. This is only the most spectacular phase of the conflict, but, as we shall note, there are many other issues involving the same essential clash of views.

"Socialized Medicine"

The term "socialized medicine" is rather loosely used even among medical men. A system in which a family shares the burdens and expense of an ill member could well be called socialized medicine. If the ill member is a child or very old person, his ability, as an individual, to pay for his own care is disregarded, and the family group, usually to the limit of its resources, assumes the expense. If the family has been able and foresighted enough to carry health insurance, a large part of the cost may be born by a huge, impersonal corporation. If a pauper is stricken ill and it becomes known, the community or even the nation

may step in to provide for the expense of medical care. All these, and many other generally accepted aspects of our present provisions for health, are as truly social as are tax-supported programs. Certainly the provision by government of physicians, hospitals, and other facilities for veterans of wars, and for such considerable population elements as the reservation Indians, is "socialized medicine." If the term is so used there is no issue in the United States as to whether or not we should have socialized medicine. The only issues are: Should we greatly extend or alter what we already have, and under what specific types of laws?

Advocates of the extension of socialized medicine urge that the national government should, probably through an insurance scheme partly supported by individual and family contributions and partly by general taxation, guarantee to every person, according to his needs, a minimum of medical care as would be defined by current standards. Opponents feel that any radical extension of government financed medical service would tend inevitably to place the care of health under bureaucratic control to the detriment of the quality of that care and of the all-important patient-physician relationship. They also point to the possible drains on an over-burdened Federal treasury and to a drift toward socialism, of which socialized medicine would presumably be a significant part.[1]

Cultural Values. The debate has been carried on, usually at a high emotional pitch, for many years without resolving itself, because, like so many such controversies, it involves conflict among high cultural values which often are irreconcilable. In our culture we place high value on each individual and each human life, but we also place high value on private enterprise and self-reliance. The social problems which confront us often appear to make necessary the placing of one set of values above another, and it is difficult to agree on which are paramount. It is a similar quandry to that involved in the first problem discussed in this book—that of war: most peoples place high value on peace, and high value on national honor and sovereignty. How may we decide which ultimately shall take precedence?

Some Other Issues

A part of the increased knowledge of illness has been that having to do with contagion and infection through which disease spreads from individuals throughout communities and over large areas. This knowledge has brought legal powers to government to effect quarantines, require vaccination and inoculation, and otherwise invade what had

[1] M. M. Davis, *America Organizes Medicine*, Harper & Bros., 1941.

traditionally been spheres of private rights. Enactment and enforcement of such measures long met with widespread opposition and, to some extent, still do. Especially is this true where property rights are concerned, as in zoning laws, building codes, and other restrictions, many of which are designed as safeguards of public health. The knowledge of medical science, however, has clearly established the principle that a person's health is a concern, not only of himself, but of his neighbors and community; and the companion principle that the use one makes of his property must often be restricted in the interest of general health.

Controls Over Sources of Disease. A closely related type of issue has grown out of the knowledge that the source of much ill-health lies in drinking water, foods commonly consumed, the air people breathe in their homes, public places and places of work, and in the very medicines and drugs sold under the pretense that they cure diseases. As people have become almost entirely dependent upon distant sources and devious channels for food, drink, and medicines, and living and working conditions have tended to contaminate the air they breathe, it has become increasingly necessary to bring strict public regulation into these fields. This has involved further restriction of property rights, free enterprise, and personal and family privacy, as well as increase in taxes and costs of production, with the result that there has been and continues to be strong resistance to extensions of such controls. Yet the general principle of governmental responsibilities in such areas is well established in modern nations, even though there continues to be much controversy over specific applications.

Who May Cure Disease. One conflict has grown out of the tendency for new types of curative arts to develop, and the reluctance of outmoded ones to disappear. While there is general agreement that "quackery" or false arts of healing constitute a major threat to the health of individuals and groups, there is no agreement, even among experts, as to just where to draw the line between legitimate curative practices and "quackery." Such fields as osteopathy, chiropractry, the various "faith healing" systems, and, to a lesser extent, psychiatry, have been centers of intense debate in legislatures and other legal control groups. The confusions in this matter are reflected in the unevenness of state laws regarding regulation of who may or may not practice the curative arts. Usually such controversies involve conflicts of cultural values which make them almost impossible of resolution—such values as that placed on human lives, religious belief, the label of "science," and exaggerated emphasis on the newest as the best.

From what has been said of these various issues—and others involved in health problems—it may be seen that contradictions among our highest cultural values are a complicating factor of great significance. This is true, although not always as obviously, throughout all social problems and is a part of the explanation of the formula—need for change versus resistance to change—which is basic to our study of these problems. It also brings into clearer focus the significance of the differences among social sciences, especially as between those which emphasize human motivation and behavior as essentially rational and those which stress its nonrational bases. Advocates of progress and reform in these fields work upon the assumption that once a method or a plan is demonstrated as superior to prevailing practices and beliefs it will forthwith become widely accepted. The fact known by those who attempt to put reform into practice is that no amount of demonstration will quickly break down deep-seated habits and beliefs, no matter how little logic there may be in them.

Population Composition and Health

Necessary to basic understanding of health problems of our own or other large groups is analysis of the relation of population composition to general health. The composite human life span may be represented in graphic form by a broad "U," with extremely high death rates in the early months of life and a steeply rising death rate after middle age. The infant mortality rate, or the proportion of deaths among babies under one year of age, is higher than for any other single year until late senescence. Every one in a population passes through that first hazardous year, or dies in it, but very few will reach the extremes of age. Therefore the birth rate, determining what proportion of a population is, at any given time, in the first year of life, is of primary importance in the health problems of any people. Among various peoples, contrasts may be found, but following a general rule—the higher the proportion of infants in the population, the smaller the proportion of infants surviving beyond the first year. As birth rate declines, and the proportion of babies falls, the infant mortality rate (number of infants who die each year, per thousand live births) falls more rapidly.

The death rate remains relatively high in the few years of life following infancy, although much lower than in the first year, but it rapidly levels off at a low figure which continues until mid-life. An exception is among women of child-bearing years, for whom there is a slight rise. After middle life, the death rate again climbs in a continuous curve until, in the years of very old age, it is at a point comparable to infant mortality.

Disregarding all other factors than age, this means that populations with many very young children in proportion to other age groups have large health problems of the kinds that especially constitute dangers to the very young. Populations which are largely in the long mid-period of life, with comparatively few children and few aged, have relatively small health problems. Those which have unusually large proportions of aged persons, as ours will have in the future, have increased health problems of the type that constitute threats to the old.

Sex Ratios. Although we may theoretically disregard factors other than age distribution, actually many others do enter to complicate this important basic picture. One minor complication is the ratio of sexes in the population. Women and girls, quite uniformly, have lower death rates and greater life expectancy than men and boys. Thus a population with a high proportion of females would have a lesser health problem than one with a high proportion of men, at least as far as dangerous and potentially fatal ailments are concerned. On the other hand, women are susceptible to special health hazards related to childbirth and to "change of life" following the child-bearing years, so that the type of health problems would vary, as well as their general seriousness.

Race and Ethnic Groups. It has generally been disproved that racial and ethnic groups, as such, have different susceptibility and immunity to diseases; but it remains true that where these different groups, under cultural compulsions, must live different kinds of lives, they have widely differing mortality and morbidity rates. In the United States, for instance, as long as Negroes are barred from health and educational advantages accessible to others, the general health problem will be greater than it otherwise would be. This is also true of other minority groups, and historically has been true of newly arrived immigrants.

Changing Life Conditions

The urbanization of life has contributed in a number of ways, some of which have been noted, to the type of health problems confronting modern societies. The congestion of modern cities and the strains of urban life have tended in many ways to increase the likelihood of illness. At the same time cities have provided the means to make possible large, well-equipped hospitals and clinics, and concentrations of highly trained health specialists. One great problem now confronting our own coun is the lack of adequate health personnel and facilities in rural areas, comparison with urban.

Other Changes. General changes in food habits incident to the rise in living standards and improvements of productive techniques present a similarly confused picture. As a people, we are better nourished than were our forebears, but we have also developed preferences for some types of food which tend to weaken our digestive organs and processes. Since ideas on diets, even among specialists in the field, change from time to time, there is little certainty regarding general trends. The same doubts exist both as to the changes in quantity and quality of exercise which characterize urban life ways.

Changes in types of occupation present a clearer picture of trends in health hazards. There is little doubt that many occupations which employ large numbers of people have related to them occupational diseases and hazards to life and health. These hazards are found mainly in various kinds of mining, and in types of manufacturing where substances and chemicals, in themselves health hazards, are involved. Unusual safeguards exist in many such occupations to somewhat offset the particular threats they present to individual and group health.

Special Phases of Health Problems

Increasing as a cause of death and of temporary or permanent incapacitation are accidents—industrial and other. Machine production techniques from farm to factory have tended to increase this type of hazard and call forth many types of safety devices and regulations. Rapid growth and extension of automobile and airplane transportation have added to mounting tolls from accidents, which have been aggravated by crowded urban traffic lanes and the combination of congestion and speed on highways. In the case of accidents, as in many other health hazards, the individual frequently is at the mercy of others, so that preventive programs, to be effective, have necessarily meant curtailment of personal choice, as, for instance, in the multitude of traffic regulations which have developed with increasing use of automobiles.

Venereal Diseases. Venereal diseases (sometimes called social diseases) present special problems. Considerable advance has been made in the United States in recent years toward bringing these diseases under partial control, but such progress has been difficult because of the stigma which is attached to them and to the type of conditions, such as prostitution, which tend to spread them. Highly infectious, venereal diseases may spread rapidly and widely unless their presence is known and treatment and isolation controls reach those who are infected. Venereal diseases undermine the entire physiological constitution and may bring in their wake many conditions which seriously incapacitate and eventually bring

death to those who are infected but not treated in the early stages of the disease.[2]

Psychoneuroses. Of increasing concern in recent years have been the psychoneuroses which temporarily or permanently incapacitate millions of persons in the United States. Of the psychoses (insanities) which are the more serious, two kinds are generally noted—the organic and the functional. The organic psychoses may be congenital or the result of injuries and diseases that affect the functioning of the mind and nervous system, often damaging them beyond repair, and making persons permanent burdens upon others. The functional psychoses are mental breakdowns due to strains arising in efforts to adjust to frustrating life conditions, representing an extreme form of "escape." As these functional disorders have become better understood they have yielded more and more to a variety of treatments. The incidence of psychoses correlates roughly with age, the older being much more susceptible than the young, except in the case of congenital disorders. This means that as a population becomes older the general rate tends to increase. Once thought of as almost entirely hereditary, it is now doubted that much mental disease, or even the predisposition to mental breakdown, is biologically inherited. Psychoses carry considerable social stigma in our culture—although this appears to be declining—and has especially distressing affects upon families that are directly concerned. It brings to them heavy expense, a feeling of shame, and, for many, the fears that the diseases are hereditary and that therefore other individuals in the family may be foredoomed to insanity.

The neuroses, or malfunctioning of the nervous system less serious than psychoses, are more widespread. They are seldom incapacitating although they do narrow the fields in which affected individuals may function efficiently. The neurotic personality is fairly commonplace in our society, and is seldom considered of sufficient seriousness to call for institutionalization or specialized treatment. As the term psychoneuroses would indicate, there is a considerable overlap between psychoses and neuroses.

Alcoholism, Drug Addiction. Special types of psychoneurotic conditions are closely associated with alcoholism and drug addiction. In these cases the mental and nervous unbalance is now generally recognized by specialists as causative to the addiction to drugs and alcohol, but this recognition has come quite recently and it is just beginning to become the basis for treatment. At the same time alcoholism and drug addiction are,

[2] H. J. Locke, "Changing Attitudes Toward Venereal Diseases," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. IV, 1939, pp. 836-843.

in turn, causes of further serious psychoneurotic conditions, so that there exists, in effect, a vicious circle, which makes effective treatment difficult. As in the case of venereal diseases and mental breakdown in its other forms, the strong social stigma attached to alcoholism and drug addiction in our culture have made open treatment, and therefore adequate control, more difficult than would otherwise have been the case.

Feeble-Mindedness. Often confused with psychoses is feeble-mindedness, or retarded mental development, although its essential nature is quite different. Those who suffer from psychoses are often persons of normal or superior mental development whose minds break, whereas the feeble-minded are those whose mental abilities fail to develop. Feeble-mindedness, once considered almost entirely hereditary, is now considered as, in part at least, due to controllable conditions, such as diet, general health, social adjustment, and social incentives. Although generally incurable at the present state of knowledge, experiments have shown that intelligence quotients in children can be raised within limits; and quite probably with increasing understanding, even more will become possible in this direction.

The Eugenic Movement. Earlier beliefs that psychoses and feeble-mindedness were mainly hereditary gave impetus to the eugenic movement in this and other countries. The underlying notions of this movement have been that by controlled human breeding the general type of human beings could be improved, or at least the human type could be kept from deteriorating. It has been pointed out that the well-educated and successful tend to have few children, whereas the less successful and those of little education have large families. From this it has been deduced that feeble-mindedness would increase, and the proportion of mentally superior people would diminish in the general population, unless measures were taken to control breeding. The positive phase of the eugenic program has been to encourage—by education largely—the mating of the mentally superior, and to induce such matings to produce more children. Such programs, calling for external controls over the mating process, run counter to the prevailing notions of romantic freedom of choice and have made little headway. The negative phase of the eugenic programs call for discouragement of procreation among the mentally inferior through restrictive marriage laws and sterilization of the unfit. In application of negative eugenic programs of these types there has been so much confusion among ideas of mental fitness, moral values, and physical fitness that little has been done with them, although some states in this country have laws permitting sterilization of dangerous criminals, the

feeble-minded, and psychotics. The trends in the direction of ascribing psychoses—and to an extent, feeble-mindedness—to external conditions rather than heredity, and high cultural values regarding individual rights have further retarded these movements. While, as pseudoscience, strong theoretical cases may be made for eugenics, it is difficult to conceive of concrete instances of applications where confusions of ideas and cultural values do not enter to raise grave uncertainties.

Probably the most systematic large-scale application of a combination of positive and negative eugenic measures was that in Germany under the Nazi regime, when the whole eugenic idea was tied to the fallacious Aryan myth, discussed in Chapter VII on "Race and Ethnic Conflict." The resulting cruelties and injustices of the program which condoned widespread slaughter of Jews and the breaking up of many family ties—abhorrent to outside observers but apparently justified in the thinking of many in Germany—demonstrated, in the extreme, dangers in too-ready acceptance of eugenic programs at the present state of our knowledge of human hereditary processes.

Relation to Other Problems

The relation of problems of health to all other social problems may readily be seen. A large part of this chapter has shown how closely they are linked to problems of families and the family institution. It also clearly shows that heath problems cause, and result from, poverty, and are related to discriminations growing out of racial and cultural prejudices. The relation of health to the problem of crime is mainly indirect, through poverty and disorganization of the family, which, as shown in Chapter VIII on "Crime and Delinquency," contribute so largely to the development of criminal personalities and behavior.

The relation of health to war is complex and deserves brief special treatment. War itself contributes to higher death rates and brings disablement to large numbers of persons. Of increasing concern in recent wars has been the increase in psychoneuroses among fighting men and women, and throughout civilian populations. Dislocated populations, interrupted food production, the breakdown of water supplies and sanitary facilities, and shortages of physicians, nurses, and other health technicians all contribute to conditions highly favorable to widespread disease. Both during prolonged wars, and as an aftermath, the danger of epidemics and plagues in devastated areas is great. Deaths attributable to diseases incident to the disruptions caused by war usually greatly exceed those on battlefields. The threats to general health in new devices for waging war are incalculable—such devices as the atomic bomb and those included under the heading of biological warfare. In all probability

future wars will be far more disastrous to general health than have any in the past.

On the other hand, it may be noted that in populations not immediately affected by the physical destruction of war—as the United States during the Second World War—a general, at least temporary, rise in living standards may result. Despite many deprivations brought to the civilian population of this country during the war, many changes, notably those in increased food consumption and changes in dietary habits in previously impoverished groups, tended to raise general health levels. It may also be noted that wars tend to bring into development and general use new methods of preventing and controlling diseases in the armed forces which become available to the general population more readily than they otherwise would. Despite such gains for limited groups resulting from war, it is generally agreed that the cost in human misery, sickness, disablement, and death far exceeds any advantages.

One indirect effect of war has been the thorough physical and mental examinations given to millions of people, which have given us a far better knowledge of the general health conditions than we otherwise might have had. Usually such increased knowledge has been somewhat disconcerting, tending to reveal the average physical and mental health to be considerably below ideal standards which had previously been assumed to be norms. Despite the disappointment in this regard, however, the very awareness of the extent of some health problems, previously lacking, has led to increased concerted efforts to better such conditions as a necessary phase of national preparedness as well as of general welfare.

Health and Personality

Health problems are closely related to several social problems which will be discussed in some detail in later chapters. A phase of this relationship, full significance of which is just beginning to be comprehended, lies in the close interplay between human personality and sickness, especially under the cultural conditions prevailing in our own society. Prolonged illness obviously tends to frustrate and warp normal social adjustments, with resultant unfavorable effects on personality. Less obviously, but equally important, social maladjustments and personality disorders are causative of illness and physical incapacitation. This is most easily discernable in the case of hypochondriacs, who habitually use feigned illness as an escape from social responsibilities and obligations or to gain attention which otherwise is lacking. It goes much further, however, than this simple feigning of illness, and undoubtedly, without the victims or others being aware, social and personality maladjustments are causa-

tive factors in much illness, some of it serious in nature. Psychoneuroses are chiefly traceable to anxieties and strains growing out of efforts at successful adjustments, sometimes the noticeable effects coming long after the causative social experiences. It is probable that some ailments connected with glandular and organic malfunctioning are brought on and aggravated by "worry." Some heart ailments, high blood pressure, and ulcers are a few of the illnesses which are suspected of being closely related to causes lying largely in the personality of individuals, and their modes of striving with life conditions in a highly competitive social order. This field of probabilities has been opened by the research of the relatively new specialty of psychiatry. Much exploratory work remains to be done before a fund of precise knowledge will exist to furnish a practical guide to general controls, such as we now have for most germ-borne diseases.

Medical Research

Unprecedented in human history is the vast amount of resources and personnel engaged in health research. Governments, huge private foundations, universities, and colleges the world over—but principally in the United States—are engaged in intensive study of every conceivable phase of health problems, from sanitation and diet to search for causes of the common cold. This systematic, concerted, and widespread effort brings almost daily discoveries in the various fields, and quite probably advances will come at an accelerated rate in future years.

Much research carried on in fields not directly related to health problems brings results which nevertheless will affect their nature. Findings in new techniques of agriculture, the synthetic food products, and means for better processing, storage and transportation of foods will continue to change human diets. New types of recreation and changes in work habits will have their influence, as will improved housing and better city planning. Indeed, it is difficult to think of any field of research which may not, for better or worse, have important bearing on future health problems.

Summary

This discussion of health problems has emphasized several points which also have a bearing on the understanding of other types of social problems. Because we live in a society dominated by economic institutions, discussion of health problems tends to be largely in economic terms—those of costs and ability to pay. The essential controversies, as that over "socialized medicine," bring out conflicts among the most fundamental values in our culture—as the high value placed upon each

individual life versus the equally high value on individual self-reliance. Such conflicts make the controversies extremely difficult to resolve and retard action in any significant direction. In the field of health reform we encounter obstacles in the nonrational elements in human nature which cling to old habits and beliefs despite demonstrated superiority of new techniques.

The health problems of a given population, as its other social problems, are largely relative to the composition of that population, and shifts in that composition such as are now occurring in our own age-group ratios. They are also affected by other basic changes in life conditions, as diet available, industrialization, and urbanization.

In brief, problems of health are interrelated, and have much in common, with all other social problems.

Terms

Socialized medicine
Life expectancy
Morbidity
Infant mortality
Senility
Contagion
Infection
Psychoses
Neuroses
Venereal
Congenital
Hypochondriac

Questions

1. What are the principal arguments for and against extension of socialized medicine in this country?
2. How can you account for differences of opinion as to who should be permitted to practice curative arts?
3. How do health problems vary with composition of population?
4. In what way has social stigma been a hindrance to control of diseases?
5. What are the effects of war on health problems?
6. How are health and personality related?

READING LIST

Carl Binger, *The Doctor's Job.* W. W. Norton & Co., 1945.
F. Goldmann, *Public Medical Care: Principles and Problems.* Columbia University Press, 1945.
Karen Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts,* W. W. Norton & Co., 1945.
C. Landis and J. D. Page, *Modern Society and Mental Disease.* Farrar & Rinehart, 1938.
Clarence A. Peters, *Free Medical Care.* W. W. Wilson Co., 1946.
Henry E. Sigerist, *Civilization and Disease.* Cornell University Press, 1943.
B. J. Stern, *American Medical Practice in the Perspective of a Century.* Commonwealth Fund, 1944.

CHAPTER XI

Urbanization

The development of civilizations and the concentration of populations in cities appear to have gone together in human history, each as cause and effect of the other. The amassing of surplus labor, wealth, and other resources necessary for civilization have been possible only in cities; whereas the trade, commerce, and transportation facilities which civilization has brought have encouraged the growth of larger cities. In the ancient world it was cities such as Babylon, the capitals of the old Egyptian empire, the city states of Greece, and finally Rome and Byzantium (later Constantinople) that were the centers and seats of highly developed culture systems with their political, economic, religious, and esthetic developments. In these earlier civilizations, the growth of cities had its original impetus in the need for defense against nomadic peoples or pirates, as notably in the case of Rome; or for religious centers. At a later stage they developed as commercial centers. From the beginning, more recent cities have developed at the cross roads of trade.

In recent history there has been a steady, and apparently world-wide, drift of people from the open country to towns, and from towns to cities. Many hundreds of millions of individuals have been involved in this movement, and it has radically altered the nature of organized group life. With it, isolation of small groups has practically vanished, congestion has greatly increased, and human relations have become largely depersonalized. For the cities the rapid influx has meant, usually, growth with little or no planning, and an accumulation of resultant problems—housing, health, relief, traffic, and others. For the open country, hamlets, and villages it has meant general decline and decay often reflected in group-wise poverty; shortages in facilities for health maintenance, education, and wholesome recreation; and the weakening of various institutions, such as the familial, governmental, and religious. It may also be recalled that the rural to urban migratory movements are selective, draining from rural areas those in the productive years of life, and leaving behind large proportions in childhood years and the upper ages.

It is true that the movement of people from open country and villages to towns and cities has been accompanied by a steady migration

from cities to smaller communities and open country, but by far the greater of the two opposing movements has been the city-ward one. Even at the time that the American land frontier was serving to draw from eastern cities the poor and debt-ridden—a westward trek which attracted wide attention because of its dramatic nature—statistics show that the dominant trend in the United States was steady urbanization. It is notable that in our entire history as a nation there was only one five-year period, from 1930 to 1935, during the depth of depression, when there was a net movement of people from city to country. This is illustrative of what has been happening, but in a somewhat less marked degree, the world over.

The Ecology of Cities

Cities in the United States, Great Britain, and other comparable countries have come in for considerable study in recent decades, and much has been learned about their location, internal growth, economic, political, and other living arrangements. Those things about cities which can easily be shown on maps are usually referred to as the ecology of the city, and furnish a starting point for the study of cities. Strangely enough, the countries which have the largest proportions of their populations in large cities are relatively sparsely populated, as for example the continent of Australia, and various countries of South America, notably Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Europe is more highly urbanized than the United States, but the trend toward urbanization has been more rapid in this country. Considering the area and total populations involved, Asia and Africa remain comparatively rural.

Nearly all of the large cities of the world are seaports, or are located on rivers which give them ready access to the sea. This tends to emphasize the importance of transportation to the growth of cities in the modern world, and most such cities can best be explained in terms of transportation routes. As modes of transportation have changed, so has the location of cities been somewhat affected, as when railways in the United States made possible the development of such inland metropolises as Kansas City, Missouri, and Denver. There is always a tendency for new modes of travel to follow old paths, however, so that most important transportation centers remain such even when the means of travel change.

Cities of the United States. Nearly 60 per cent of the population of the United States is classed as urban,[1] that is, town and city dwelling. In addition to the part of the population officially classed as urban, there are

[1] The United States Census Bureau classes as urban all communities of more than 2,500 people. In other countries the official classification varies, so that often, as between countries, the comparison of official urban-rural groupings is misleading.

millions of people who live in suburban areas, officially classed as rural, but actually urban in all important characteristics.

Most of the great cities of the United States are to be found in a relatively limited area within a few hundred miles of the greatest of them all, the City of New York. Other lesser constellations of cities are found bordering the Great Lakes, the Pacific shore, the Gulf of Mexico, and the portion of the Atlantic Coast further south from New York. Relatively few of the larger cities are found inland. Although some of the cities are known as "industrial" centers, all are centers of trade and crossroads of transportation.

Historically, most of the cities of the United States have had rapid growth, and few have experienced loss of population over any considerable period of time. This reflected both the rapid growth of the American population generally and the increasing proportion of people who moved into cities. This rapid growth has been a matter for local pride, and the idea of population shrinkage has been abhorred.

The Pattern of Cities. In their growth, the cities of the world have followed certain general patterns that may be designated roughly as the mononucleated and the polynucleated. The mononucleated city is one with a single well-marked center, so that such terms as "down town" or *the* business center has a definite meaning in terms of location. The polynucleated city is one in which there are many widely dispersed centers, no one of which is easily recognized as *the* center. Quite typically cities of the Orient have been polynucleated, or many-centered; whereas those of Europe, and especially of the United States, have been mononucleated or single-centered. There is at present, however, a tendency for American cities to become somewhat decentralized.

American cities, almost without exception,[2] have been unplanned in their development and growth. Such planning as there has been has come late in their development and has been fragmentary and incomplete. Yet the cities conform rather uniformly to a general scheme which can be very roughly approximated by drawing a series of concentric circles of different size.

The central circle represents the main business center, where the retail stores, banks, better hotels, large theaters, and principal office buildings are closely clustered. In growing cities, the space between the middle circle and the next one is referred to as the "zone in transition," an area which is being taken over rapidly for business purposes but which

2 Washington, D. C., was carefully planned before the city was begun, but has far outgrown the original plan so that large parts of the city may be considered, as other cities, unplanned.

still retains some characteristics of a residential district. This area is one which is characterized by ramshackle dwellings, congestion, cheap rents, and a transient population.

Moving away from the central district, the next area is one of flats, cheap apartments, slums, and generally crowded and inadequate living conditions. Farther out are the principal residential areas, first that of multiple-family dwelling units, the better apartment houses, and generally more favorable conditions. Still farther out are the single-family dwellings and better homes, and beyond are the commuter zones and suburbs. Not invariably, but usually, the suburban areas offer the finest homes and most favorable living conditions.

Cutting across these various "zones" of the typical growing American city are numerous intrusive zones which do not fit into a concentric plan, but follow arteries of transportation, as railroad lines or highways, or segregated residential areas, as the "black belt" of Chicago.

Vertical and Horizontal Growth. Reflected in the various zones with their characteristics is the close relationship between vertical and horizontal growth. All cities tend to grow outward from their centers, and as they do, the buildings in the business center tend to become taller, because there is a greater area with a greater population to be served by the business concerns confined to the relatively small area of the business center. Conversely, since a large proportion of those who work in the growing (vertically) business center commute to and from their places of employment, the growth of the business district is reflected in the development of more and more suburban areas.

The flow of suburban people into the center of the city to work, shop, or seek amusement each day means a constantly growing congestion and increasing traffic problem in the heart of large cities, especially in those few hours of the day when this fluidity is greatest. All large cities are faced by this increasing traffic problem, especially in and around the central business district, and much of the fragmentary city planning which has taken place has been an effort to meet the problem.

Problems of the City

There are many social problems which grow out of the constant increase in the concentration of population in cities. There is no place where change is so insistent, or where resistance to change is so strong, as in modern American cities, and most of the problems which have been discussed in previous chapters, or which will be discussed in later chapters, are more acute in the urban setting than elsewhere.

Population Characteristics. Cities represent not only congestion of population within relatively small areas, but also peculiarities of population composition and behavior. Cities attract men and women of the most productive years, and, as compared with rural areas, have relatively few old people and children. They attract more women than men, and usually have a disproportionate share of women in the ages from 15 to 35 years. Especially since 1880, they have attracted most of the immigrants, so that proportion of foreign-born and children of immigrant parents has been disproportionately large.

These population peculiarities are more pronounced in some parts of cities than in others. The suburban people and those of the better residential districts resemble the general population in composition. On the other hand, the zone in transition is peopled almost entirely by men, and has few women and children. The next zone, that of slums and flats, contains most of the newly arrived immigrants and their immediate descendants, who live in "Little Italys," "Little Polands," etc. The zone of multiple dwellings and apartments has the greatest predominance of women, and relatively few children; and only the better residential and suburban areas have population compositions which are roughly comparable to that of the entire American population.

In terms of population behavior, it may be noted that the larger the city, the lower the general birth rate. Although among some groups of city population the birth rate is high and families are large, in general city populations do not reproduce themselves by natural increase, but are dependent for maintaining their populations, or growth, upon constant recruitment from rural areas.

Institutional Problems. Basic to the social problems incident upon the growth of cities are those that involve the various institutions of the social structure. Nearly all of our institutions had their origins and development, insofar as we can ascertain, in rural life conditions. The shift of population to urban centers has meant a necessary transition of these institutions to new life conditions, and the very nature of institutions implies resistance to change.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the case of the basic familial institutions. In our American tradition the ideal family is a rural-type family—a large family with many children, with relatives other than parents and their immediate offspring included in the household—self-sufficient, and the core of all interests and activities. This ideal represents past stages of our cultural development in which such family units were possible and practicable, but it is an ideal that is poorly adapted to the conditions of city life.

Under city-life conditions the small family, or even the single, unattached person is much better adapted in many ways than is the larger family unit. The necessary adjustments of the ideal family of American tradition to the practical considerations confronting most people in urban-life conditions are basic to many of the problems of the family and domestic relations that we find in our culture today.

What is true of the family institutions is, in varying degrees, true of most of our institutions—the efforts to cling to the institutional forms of earlier, rural-life conditions among the newer conditions brought by urban concentration.

Economic Problems. Most obvious among the economic problems of the city is the disparity between extremes of poverty and wealth. Almost within hailing distance, in most American cities, slums and "flop-houses" border upon the mansions of the very wealthy.[3] People are hungry and destitute within the shadow of bulging warehouses and glistening show-windows of large department stores. These extremes, in juxtaposition, are a source of constant friction among city dwellers.

The contrast points up one of the principal economic problems growing out of urban development, the lack of security of the individual. The older forms of individual security which depended largely upon the large, self-sufficient family unit and the closely knit community have little validity in city-life conditions where the family unit is usually so small and loosely bound that it gives little assurance of security in adverse circumstances. The chief reliance, when conditions become adverse, lies in impersonal public organizations, and such dependence, reflecting traditions from an earlier time, carry a degree of social stigma that is humiliating to most individuals.

By comparison with rural areas, cities have the higher general living standards and a wealth of facilities for health improvement, education, and recreation; but these advantages are not readily accessible to the entire urban population. In every city there are "blighted" areas or slums, where congestion, inadequate and obsolete housing, and lack of the meanest of conveniences cause misery for large numbers of families and individuals. The contrast of their condition with that of the wealthy urban dwellers calls into sharp focus the malfunctioning of our modern economy. This causes widespread dissatisfaction and unrest which frequently explode into violence, and the spread of radical movements.

The contrasts of poverty and wealth in cities, while taking its present form from the high development of the factory system and industrialism, is not a new phenomenon. Throughout history it has been dramatized

[3] The contrast is pictured, though for a somewhat earlier era, in Harvey W. Zorbaugh, *The Gold Coast and the Slum,* University of Chicago Press, 1929.

and has been the basis for the "bread and circuses" policies of combatting unrest with demagoguery and displays found in all historical epochs.

A contributing factor to the wealth and poverty in cities has been the high speculative values placed upon land. Since, in the limited area of metropolitan centers, the competition for space is keen, there is a strong incentive for the wealthy to hold land for rises in price and to avoid the expenses involved in improving the land or of maintaining in good condition buildings already on it. Many of the large fortunes of the United States had their bases in such speculation. A result has often been strong resistance to constructive changes, so that American cities, for the most part, have been ugly, drab, and unwholesome places to live.

An important aspect of the economic problems of cities has been that cities, in many cases, have outgrown their economic utility. High land values, traffic problems, and rising tax rates have tended toward a recent decentralization of business and industrial activities, which, in turn, have lowered land values and tax returns from those sections of urban communities that in the past had the highest land values. The extensive use of electrical power for industries, new facile and economic modes of communication such as the telephone and teletype, and quick, cheap transportation have made extreme concentration of business and industrial units unnecessary. In the thinking of many experts, the large city as we know it has outgrown its economic utility.[4]

Pertinent both to the economic and political organization and processes of cities are the problems of public finance. The nature of city life makes necessary a wide variety of governmental functions, all of which involve expense, and many of which call for huge investments in permanent improvements and equipment, such as water supply and sewage disposal systems, street pavement and sidewalks, and street lighting. The conditions of city life call also for extensive services of many experts. There has been a tendency for city expenses, both in their totality and per capita, to increase steadily. Quite often expenses have so far outrun current income from revenues that many cities have been forced into debt, which, in turn, increases expenses by adding interest and debt retirement to other burdens on public funds. The recent tendency toward declining tax income from real estate and other sources in some cities has aggravated the entire problem.

Political Problems. The political "machine" with "boss rule" and corruption has flourished especially in American cities. The stakes of control of city governments with the large opportunities for patronage in jobs, sale of protection to illegal business firms, and a variety of forms of graft

[4] This point of view is well summarized in W. S. Thompson, *Population Problems*, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942, Chapters XIX and XX.

have given rise at one time or another to "machines" in nearly every city of the country. The relative ease and efficiency with which controlling blocks of votes can be organized, and the general indifference of the majority of voters, have been the bases of "machines," which, in most cases, have been closely allied with the forces of the "underworld" of crime and exploitation.

A companion political problem lies in the jurisdictional limitations of cities which have direct control only as far as the city limits extend, even though close interdependencies exist between the city proper and the communities of a considerably larger area. The sources of water and food supplies, the disposal of sewage, and numerous other vital interests often lie outside city limits. Large numbers of persons who reside beyond the city limits depend directly or indirectly upon the city for their livelihoods, and usually the city must bear much of the burden in supplying adequate transportation and other facilities to outside regions. As the automobile has become the chief means of transportation there have grown up on the fringes of most cities centers of vice which thrive on city patronage but are not under the control of city law enforcement officers. Most cities have, by one means or another, found partial solutions to such problems by working with or through other political subdivisions as counties and state governments, but such arrangements are apt to be inefficient and to involve overlapping and duplication of governmental functions.

Social Problems. A few of the social problems, such as those of extreme poverty and "blighted" areas, have already been mentioned, but others need to be considered in connection with the rapid rise of American cities. One of the most obvious has been a result of the fact that since 1880 the large cities have been the scene of adjustment of most immigrants from other ethnic groups into American life ways. The newly arrived immigrants have contributed largely to the problems of poverty, health, and law enforcement. Although the number of immigrants has declined greatly since 1914, there remain in most cities Chinatowns, Little Italys, and other more or less segregated urban areas where at least some of the alien ways of life are still characteristic. The people living in such areas resist complete assimilation, and often find themselves subject to discriminatory practices. More or less continuous conflict takes place between such groups and the dominant culture which surrounds them, at times bringing open and widespread violence.

As immigration from abroad has declined, the influx of rural and southern Negroes has resulted in problems similar to, but more acute than, those of the immigrant colonies. This movement of Negroes which was large during the First World War, and was extended and increased

in the Second World War, has led to the rapid development of segregated Negro residential and business sections in all of our large cities. Its effects have differed from those of European immigration in that the long-run trend for most immigrant groups has been toward complete assimilation, and it may reasonably be assumed that the urban problems they have created will eventually decline or disappear. Since the "color" line places definite limits on the degree to which Negroes may become assimilated, no such eventual solution can be looked forward to in their case, and they pose a permanent adjustment problem for cities. Since all indications are for a continuation, indefinitely into the future, of the rural to urban flow of Negroes, this particular problem may well become more acute.[5]

Personality Problems. The various problems—economic, political, and social—which have been sketched above all have their reflections in the adjustments and maladjustments of individuals to city-life ways. Aside from these derivative adjustment problems there are problems of the human personality which stem more directly from the nature of life conditions as they are found in cities, and especially in large metropolitan centers.

Perhaps the most basic of these effects of city-life conditions is the depersonalization of human relations. In cities, most of the human contacts one makes—on the busy thoroughfare, in stores and offices, at places of amusement—are contacts with strangers, and the attitudes among persons is largely one of indifference. Those few ties which remain relatively personal and intimate must bear unusual burdens of strains incident to long separation of person from person and diversity of interest. Mainly the depersonalization means for the personality a peculiar kind of isolation from one's fellows. It is a matter of common experience that one can be lonely in the midst of the largest crowds. True congeniality is difficult to achieve, and this results in many substitutes which seem to be especially necessary in city life—substitutes in the form of commercial entertainment and amusement, especially the types in which one may vicariously, for a brief time, identify himself or herself with an actor on the stage or screen, or the hero or heroine of a novel.

The depersonalization of relations also leads, as previously noted, to a decline in effectiveness of the usual social controls—that is, those controls which depend for their success upon deep concern for the opinions of others with whom one has contact. The personality results of

[5] A clear and objective picture of the city-ward drift of Negroes is given in S. Drake and H. R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945.

such weakened controls may be summed up in the term "demoralization," the incidence of which is high in urban life.

Rural Problems

With all the kaleidoscopic complexity of modern cities as social organisms, it is far easier to generalize about them and their problems than it is to generalize about rural life. To illustrate, we may, for a moment, confine our study to the American rural scene. A description of the characteristics of rural life in North Dakota would have little or no pertinence for rural life in South Carolina, nor for that of the lower Rio Grande valley, or the orange groves of Southern California. Rural areas of New England present few parallels to the livestock range lands of Arizona and New Mexico.

Even within a given area there are wide contrasts in life ways of the non-farming rural villagers and the farmers with whom they trade. The small mining town, the loggers' camp, the seaside resort village, and the string of filling stations along the highway outside any town are all parts of the rural life of the nation. Nothing that might be said of one segment of these diverse elements and regions would apply with equal validity to all others.

In order to facilitate analysis, we may first eliminate from consideration those rural communities that are appendages of urban centers, whose life ways and problems are more truly urban than rural. For the remainder of the rural population, a division is suggested into those rural communities devoted to semi-industrial or industrial activities, as mining, lumbering, transportation activities, or manufacturing; and those primarily devoted to agriculture and services for those engaged in agriculture.

Roughly one-half of our rural people are engaged in agriculture or are members of households whose immediate support is agriculture. This group constitutes about one-fifth of the population of the United States. Nearly the same proportion of the population resides in villages whose main function is to provide goods and services for those who live by agriculture, and whose support, therefore, comes indirectly from agriculture. These people include the village banker, storekeeper, service station attendant, lawyer, and a host of others, together with members of their households. The analysis of rural life and problems is greatly simplified if it is confined largely to those persons and communities whose economy is oriented chiefly to agricultural production.

Economic Problems. The use of "rural" in the sense of agriculture and its dependent economy gives emphasis to economic problems, since the

economy is basic in distinguishing this part of our national life. The outstanding obvious fact about our agricultural economy is that it is largely subsidized, actually or potentially, by government, a tacit recognition of a disadvantaged position in comparison with other phases of our economic life. A part of the understanding of this disadvantaged position lies in the double hazard of farming. The farmer more than other producers is at the mercy of largely unpredictable and uncontrolable weather conditions on the one hand and equally at the mercy of market fluctuations on the other. If we are to be assured of a sufficient farm production each year, agriculture must plan for a surplus production so that if weather conditions are unfavorable there will still be enough. This means that, if weather conditions are favorable, the farms and ranches are capable of great overproduction which in turn may depress prices to levels that are ruinous for agriculture. Thus it has been necessary, in order to insure enough production, to provide guarantees against ruinously low prices.

Less obvious, but equally significant in understanding agriculture's economic problems, is the tendency of farms to remain small, economically isolated production units lacking central control and the power of business combination, whereas other segments of our economy have more and more moved toward large-scale and highly centralized control in the forms of corporate organization and tight trade associations. The prices that farmers must pay for what they purchase are determined largely by a few persons with a dominant voice in particular industries, who have at their command the services of expert advisers with close knowledge of market potentialities and trends. The price that the farmer receives for what he sells, in the absence of government guarantees, is determined mainly by relatively blind competition of many thousands of small producers. Thus it has become almost axiomatic in agricultural economies that the "farmer's dollar" buys less than other dollars, meaning that for time and energy expended, and risk involved, the agricultural producer gets less return than other large groups in our economy.

This picture is generaly valid, even though there is an increasing trend in the direction of large-scale and corporate farming which eventually may make agricultural operation more nearly like other segments of our economy. This trend still meets strong resistance due to the American tradition which pictures the family-operated farm as an ideal way of life.

There are many regional differences in farm economy. By most criteria the general living standards and financial stability of agriculture is highest in the region bordering on the Great Lakes, and lowest in the southeastern states. The latter area has especially acute problems of farm tenancy among Negro and "poor white" farmers. This especially

disadvantaged area is the most rural area of the country, if we measure by numbers and proportion of population immediately dependent upon agriculture.

Political Problems. What has been written above concerning the need for governmental subsidies for agriculture suggests one type of political problem. Farm subsidies in one form or another are as much a political problem as they are an economic one. The "farm problem" is a constant concern of several governmental departments and agencies and of the Congress. The "farm vote" is one of the important factors in Federal and state elections. The "farm planks" are among the most delicately balanced declarations in party platforms. This concern with farm problems and voting power is not because farmers are a majority in our population, or in the population of any state or region, since they are each year and decade a smaller minority, but rather because as a minority they constitute a strong and impressive pressure group. Their position is that of holding a balance of power as between and among numerous interests in the general economy, such as management, labor, and the consumer, which lends strength to their efficient lobbies.

Less spectacular but probably more significant are local political problems of rural America. The historical ideal of American democracy calls for a large measure of local self-government. In rural areas, largely, the local governmental units, as exemplified by the rural county, have become both deficient in resources for meeting the need of expanding governmental services, and lagging in efficiency. A result has been a continuous decline of local rural communities in authority over their own affairs, both through legal and extra-legal developments; and a concomitant rise in government from a distant state or national capital. The picturesque rural sheriff and constable have become largely subordinate to mobile state police. The powers of local rural school boards have given way step by step to the superior efficiency of state education departments and national accrediting agencies. The town or county board which administered public charities is largely superseded by state welfare departments and the Federal Security Administration.[6]

A recent experimental project which was set up to mobilize all public and governmental agencies within a county which might contribute to the solutions of rural community problems was highly revealing. The agencies which were active in the project included eleven agencies of the Federal government, five of the state government, and only two of the county. While these figures would vary from area to area, they give some

[6] A. E. Morgan, *The Small Community: Foundations of Democratic Life*, Harper & Bros., 1942.

idea of the trends of governmental functions as they bear upon the rural community.

Social Problems. Outstanding among the social problems of rural communities are the dearth of institutional services other than those of familial institutions, and the lack of dependable and adequate support for institutional agencies. Just as rural government has experienced a long decline in effectiveness, the rural church, rural school, and rural economic structure have increasingly failed to meet the demands of changing life conditions. Since a primary function of all institutional arrangements is to provide avenues for rise and decline in status, the rural social structure reflects the general institutional deficiency. Although most rural areas lack the extremes of poverty and wealth found in urban areas, such differences in status as are found are usually much more fixed and unchanging. The rural class system has much more rigidity than city social structure. A product of this rigidity is the discontent found especially among rural youths, giving impetus to their city-ward migrations; and a lack of incentive for self-improvement among rural people.

Other rural social problems, varying sectionally, result from sharp cleavages and conflicts involving prejudices, differences in vital interests, and misunderstandings. There is a long history, in this and other countries, of conflict between farmers and town and village residents, sometimes over control of schools or churches, sometimes over commercial and banking transactions, but always revealing deep-seated mutual suspicions and mistrust. This type of conflict is evidenced by the organized deliberate efforts of businessmen in rural communities to promote better relations with their farm customers.

In some areas racial and ethnic conflict persist in rural communities, where they are at times more violent and lasting than in urban centers. Outstanding examples may be found in the southeastern states and those of the Pacific Coast. Already mentioned, and closely related, are conflicts between the relatively stable farm operators and the more transient farm laborers. Usually the rural disadvantaged groups are less capable of organized defense of their own interests and therefore more vulnerable to individual and group exploitation.

Urban Dominance

Although the problems of urban centers, especially the larger cities, and rural communities are usually treated separately, in reality they so overlap that such treatment is largely a matter of selection and emphasis, disregarding the essential interrelatedness of rural and urban life proc-

esses. In this connection several things should be noted. First, although the contrasts between the large city and the smallest hamlet are obvious, each is part of a continuum which includes communities of every conceivable size, and nowhere, except arbitrarily (as in census statistics), can a dividing line be drawn. Second, all communities, urban and rural, are a part of a general prevailing trend of urbanization, even though the speed and extent of that trend varies from community to community. Third, the prestige of large cities has become such that many of its distinctive ways and characteristics are becoming impressed upon the most isolated farmsteads, this trend being aided and abetted by the ever-increasing efficiency of mass sales media and methods.

Aspects of Urbanization. Thus far, urbanization has been treated chiefly as a product of farm-to-city migration, but other aspects of perhaps equal significance need some attention. This migratory movement involves many millions of people in the United States each year, and, in part accounts for the growth of the urban population. However, another type of development is the growth of rural villages into towns, and resulting inter-community competition. It is probably true, in the United States, that every rural community dreams of growing to urban size and status. Often, if such dreams materialize into concrete action, they involve steps taken at the expense of other and neighboring rural communities. A village in a sparsely settled county may aspire to become the seat of county government, to attract to itself a railway line or important highway, or a manufacturing plant. It may develop as a shopping center, or promote a local college. Such efforts and programs may begin growth cycles which enhance the size and prestige of the one community while neighboring villages and hamlets decline. Many of the large cities of the country have had their beginnings in such inter-community competitive strivings, and doubtless even more communities which have remained rural have had their growth retarded or have even declined in the same types of competitive situation. The most decisive factor has usually been the attraction of transportation facilities, since both the growth and internal expansion of communities are closely linked with its command of efficient transportation. A map showing the important urban centers of this or any other country has meaning only if it is also a map of the prevailing transportation routes.[7]

Still another aspect of urbanization lies in the tendency for life-ways (and therefore problems) of every hamlet and village to become increasingly like those of large urban centers. The same styles of clothes, models of automobiles, and motion pictures may be found in every commu-

[7] Dwight Sanderson, *Rural Sociology and Rural Social Organization*, John Wiley & Sons, 1942.

nity regardless of its size. The newspapers of cities, national magazines, and the best selling books go on sale in remote corners of Wyoming almost as soon as they become accessible to the people of San Francisco. The radio, telephone, telegraph, and air-mail keep all communities closely linked in thought.

Standardization and Diversification. The various aspects of urbanization have the total general effect of standardizing life into urban living patterns. The outward and obvious evidence is in the increasing sameness in appearance of communities. Less obvious are the increasing similarities in newspapers, schools, business practices, recreations, and norms of family life.

Urbanization also brings greater diversity in many phases of group life. Among the ways in which this occurs is the increased division of labor with more narrow occupational specializations. It increases the number and variety of social strata and makes for greater fluidity of individuals among the various social classes. While there are strong similarities in the general appearances of communities, there tends to be greater variety in appearance as between one part of the community and another part. School curricula tend to become more standardized for all schools, but present wider variety within each school.

Like many other of the great forces within modern societies, urbanization has, in those regards, opposing effects, and therefore is difficult to evaluate in simple, general terms. Although the great urban centers are, for the most part, unplanned and haphazard developments, they are remarkably efficient social arrangements for providing for human convenience. City populations are great impersonal aggregates of strangers, but they provide, as no other groupings can or do, for the care of unfortunates in their populations.

Urban Complexities. The confusing ambivalance of the effects of urbanization suggest the most basic problem that the trend brings to organized group life. It increases the difficulty of understanding society, and therefore the control of group life. Rural life unaffected by urban influences, is, in comparison, relatively simple; and its functioning can safely be left to the customs, traditions, and mores which develop slowly as human experiences recur within a limited range of life activities. A relatively few generalized institutions form an adequate structure for channeling individual behavior, thought, and feeling into a reasonable degree of conformity. Patterns of interdependence and reciprocities are few, and they provide a dependable basis for individual security. There is no great need for understanding these group arrangements and time-tested life ways.

As the size of urban communities increases, the need for understanding society becomes greater at the same time that such understanding becomes vastly more difficult. Custom is a less adequate and dependable guide in human relations, whereas interdependencies multiply and become more extended for all individuals. Greater reliance must necessarily be placed on deliberate planning and controls over people, and on the enforcement of reciprocal arrangements by external means. There must be more laws, more regulations, and more police.

All such deliberate activities succeed or fail as they are based upon clear knowledge of the situations and problems with which they deal. That such efforts have been only partly successful and have yielded a high incidence of failure thus far is due to a present lack of understanding in large measure. This is dramatically illustrated in law and law enforcement which have proved far from adequate substitutes for the informal primary controls at simpler levels of group life.

Summary

The large movements of people from rural areas to urban centers is one of several phases of urbanization, the result of which is rapid change in general life conditions. Such changes make necessary institutional adaptations and personal readjustments which give rise to, and intensify, numerous social problems, and apparently result in a high incidence of personal maladjustment. These problems may be considered separately, for convenience in analysis, as economic, political, and sociological. They may be considered either from the viewpoint of our large relatively unplanned cities, or the rural communities and areas. But while we have contrasts between extremes at the metropolitan end on the one hand, and the remote rural hamlet on the other, urban life ways are becoming increasingly characteristic of our whole national life, as of the life ways of other peoples. The intensity of problems—whether social or personal—roughly varies in direct proportion to the size of community even though they are found increasingly at all parts of the continuum from the very large to the very small.

Terms

Ecology
Mononucleated
Polynucleated
Zone in transition
Suburban
Commute
Multiple dwelling
Slum
Blighted area
Speculative
Decentralization
Dispersion
Depersonalization
Demoralization

Questions

1. What are the principal determinants of the location of cities?
2. Describe the typical internal structure of American cities.
3. How may the institutional problems of cities be accounted for?
4. What are the effects of depersonalization of relations on personality?
5. Why is it difficult to generalize about rural life in the United States?
6. How does urban dominance affect rural communities?

READING LIST

Paul H. Landis, *Rural Life in Process.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940.

J. Roy Leevy, "Contrasts in Rural and Urban Family Life," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. V, 1940, pp. 948-953.

R. S. Lynd and H. M. Lynd, *Middletown.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.

————————————, *Middletown in Transition.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.

L. Mumford, *The Culture of Cities.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1938.

National Resources Committee, *Our Cities: Their Role in the National Economy.* Government Printing Office, 1937.

W. F. Ogburn, *The Social Characteristics of Cities.* University of Chicago Press, 1937.

T. Lynn Smith, *The Sociology of Rural Life.* Harper & Bros., 1940.

P. Sorokin and C. C. Zimmerman, *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology.* Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

L. Wirth, "The Urban Society and Civilization," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XLVI, 1940, pp. 743-755.

CHAPTER XII

Personal Maladjustment

Among the social problems currently receiving much attention is that of the personal maladjustment of large numbers of individuals, the individual reflection of need for change which meets with resistance to change in modern societies, and especially in our own. Such maladjustment ranges from mild and vaguely realized dissatisfactions, frustrations, and feelings of inadequacy, which are a part of everyone's experience, to the extremes represented in functional insanities or such tragedies as suicide. It is impossible to isolate personal maladjustment from other social problems because it is closely interrelated with all of them—the disorganization of families, rapid urbanization, economic competition, malfunctioning of governmental institutions, and a host of others; and only in the setting of all current social dilemmas can personality maladjustment be fully understood.

There are a number of approaches to the problems of personality adjustment, including the psychological, the psychiatric, and those of the various social sciences. The psychological approach emphasizes the individual as it does in all problems and phenomena, and attempts to understand the individual's maladjustment largely in terms of the individual nervous and mental equipment. This contrasts with the social science approach, which looks rather to causes external to the individual—those which lie in a person's relations with others and with the cultural scheme in which he lives.

The psychiatric approach is largely influenced by Freudian theory, which places the individual in unavoidable conflict with his society, and stresses sex drives and their repression as basic to personality difficulties.

The Meaning of Personality

By personality is meant the sum of behavior, thought, and feeling traits which are characteristic of an individual. Such traits may be thought of as something mysterious and defying analysis and understanding, but in science they are looked upon as phenomena that can be observed and studied as are all other natural phenomena. Emphasis may be placed, as it often is, upon the peculiar and unique traits of

each individual, from which point of view the important thing about personalities is that no two are identical. For scientific purposes it is more fruitful to stress uniformities and similarities and to recognize that, although there are differences, all personalities within given culture groups have much in common—sufficient that they may be classified and yield general principles.

When the similarities are emphasized, as in the social science approach, these personality elements which are common to all members of a given group, or to which there are very few exceptions, may be generalized as human nature for that group. Thus human nature, as personality uniformities, is cultural rather than universal as is contended in many pseudoscientific theories. Each culture tends to produce the types of personality that are fitting to it, and each produces its own "human nature."

No culture, regardless of how simple, produces but a single stereotyped personality, however, and in each may be found elaborate devices for insuring that different and specialized kinds of personality are produced. For instance, in every culture, pains are taken to insure that men and women mature with differing personality traits; that those who are predestined to become the elite have personalities different from those who are destined to be the humble, and that other significant differences fit various individuals for their various life roles.[1]

In our own culture scheme, for example, very early in infancy boys and girls are dressed differently, treated differently, and trained differently. This differential shaping of personality increases as boys and girls grow older, so that upon reaching maturity there is usually a marked difference in personality between the sexes. This difference, culturally induced, serves the social function of making the two sexes complementary and interdependent, thus promoting social cohesion and insuring mating and reproduction.

The same is true of the functions served by other induced personality specializations. The end result, in a complex social scheme, is a wide variety of personality types, none complete within itself, and therefore all largely dependent upon others. Thus there is as much the need and felt desire on the part of most people to be associated with people of different personality qualities as there is for leaders to need and want followers, and followers to want and need leaders.

Development of Personality

In sociology and social psychology, development of personality is ascribed almost entirely to social experience, that is, experience of the

[1] R. T. LaPiere and Paul Farnsworth, *Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942, Part III.

individual with other individuals and with organized group life. These experiences begin when the newborn infant is ushered into the presence of his parents or nurse, and they continue throughout life. In various subtle ways this pre-existing social environment begins to evoke some responses and suppress others in the infant, so that he soon begins to conform to group expectations suited to his status as a child, to his or her sex, to his social status, and other characteristics associated with him.

As the child becomes older, the range of social influences that affect his personality development is broadened through contacts with other children, exposure to school and teachers, and random contacts with a variety of new acquaintances and strangers. All of these contacts are somewhat consistent in their influences on the developing personality; and, to the extent that they are consistent, the growing child shows uniformities with others in the group, or human nature, fitting to his specialized place in the group.

Component Elements. It clarifies analysis of personality to think of it in terms of distinguishable, though overlapping, elements. Important among these is identity. Every person must have some identity which he and others may recognize. Identity serves both to classify him with, and distinguish him from, others. When an infant is born, except in rare exceptional cases, he has a family name which identifies him as a member of the family. He later acquires another name which sets him off from others, and identifies him within the family. As he grows he becomes a member of various organizations and groups—the first grade in school, a Sunday school class, a gang of boys, and later the Boy Scouts. In achieving manhood he becomes "identified with" a community, a neighborhood, a political party, a business firm, various clubs and lodges, and numerous other groupings of people. It is noteworthy that it is membership in social groupings which constitute and define identity as an element of personality.

Closely related to identity is another element of personality—status. Status is the ranking position in any particular group relationship, and is also usually generalized as a social class position in the general society. Birth gives one the general status of his family in the community, and gives one the status within the family of being the youngest member. With maturation, status becomes more involved, and changes, as in the case of identity.[2]

2 E. Benoit-Smullyan, "Status, Status Types, and Status Interrelations," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. IX, 1944, pp. 151-161; and A. Davis, "American Status Systems and the Socialization of the Child," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. VI, 1941, pp. 345-354.

The third component element of personality is that of the roles which an individual is called upon to fill in his activities in the groups to which he belongs. Roles are closely related to identity and status, both as cause and effect. The term role is borrowed from dramatic art, and in connection with personality it refers to the necessity of each person acting many parts in his life activities, each part being learned by rehearsal and practice much as the roles assumed by actors are learned. There are roles appropriate for persons of various identity, for persons of differing status, and for the many kinds of social situations in which persons find themselves from time to time. For the man, there is his occupational role suited to his working hours, his role as husband and father in the family circle, the role he must assume at parties or on formal occasions, and others, depending upon the varied nature of his customary life.[3]

Complexity of Personality. The combinations of identity, status, and roles which determine the behavior and attitudes of individuals are complex, and their study and understanding may be considered as in its beginning stages. Very few people have very clear ideas about their own personalities, and few can analyze the personalities of others except in the most general and obvious terms. It is largely in the shifting of roles that complications arise, for the personality of any person might differ radically if the person were alone or in a particular group of persons. In mature persons there is what might be regarded as a strain toward consistency in personaity traits, but there necessarily remains the flexibility necessary for making many adjustments to changing social expectations.

Further complexities are involved in the process of maturation. As individuals advance from infancy to childhood, and from childhood to adolescence, their personalities undergo changes as social experiences accumulate and social expectations regarding them change. The behavior, thought, and feeling patterns that are appropriate to one period of development may be quite inappropriate for a later period of development, and such changes continue throughout life. Even the very old must acquire new personality traits and abandon old ones in order to meet the social expectations associated with old age.

Subjective and Objective Phases. One aspect of personality is that which consists of overt behavior and expression that can be interpreted by others, and thus constitutes the personality that others ascribe to us. It may be very different from the covert aspect of personality, which includes those parts of our thought processes and feelings which are

[3] L. S. Cottrell, Jr., "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. VII, 1942, pp. 617-620.

known only to ourselves as individuals. Each is as truly personality as the other, but the two are at no time in necessary agreement.

This distinction has been described variously by students of personality as the "reflected" or "looking-glass" self, and the "realized" self, the former being the image of our personalities we see in the regard of others toward us, the latter being our own appraisals of our personalities. We might add a third aspect to personality, the "projected" self, or the personality we visualize for ourselves and strive to achieve. Such ambitions and strivings are a part of the total personality of any individual and it may be in close agreement with, or far different from, the other aspects of personality.

The Adjusted Personality

As a prelude to discussion of the maladjusted personality, it is well, first, to consider what an adjusted personality is. Adjustment and maladjustment of persons are matters of degree rather than of opposed extremes. Everyone is to some extent adjusted to his social world, no matter how bizarre the nature of the adjustment may seem to others; and everyone is to some extent maladjusted. The norm is a degree of general adjustment which enables a person to participate confidently and effectively in group life in conformity with group standards and expectations. It implies integrity within the personality and respect from one's associates.

The degree to which a person is adjusted to his society can be judged by others only through overt behavior and expressions in specific social situations, and the success of the individual in assuming and carrying out the roles which are appropriate to him or her. Just as it is possible for actors on the stage to carry out parts without a flaw, even when they are filled with inner conflicts and inappropriate emotions, so it is possible for persons skilled in their social roles to give the impression of being better or worse adjusted than their own feelings, if known, would indicate. No two persons, no matter how intimate their relationships, ever come to know each other completely; and therefore it is impossible for anyone to ever know the exact degree of adjustment of another to his or her place in group life.

Subjective Adjustment. Although the judgment of others as to a person's degree of adjustment or maladjustment is important, it is in most cases of less significance than the subjective aspects. Subjective adjustment appears to consist in close agreement among a person's ambitions and self-evaluation, especially when these coincide with the apparent regard that others have toward one. In other words, one feels well adjusted if

his status is in keeping with his ambitions and his ideas concerning what he deserves, and if he receives from others what he considers to be the respect due him.

Adjustment is thus closely tied in with considerations of status, with its implied recognition and response. Since status systems, as well as standards of recognition, are culturally defined, the degree of adjustment of individuals is largely a matter of social phenomena, and reflects types of social experience.

Personal Maladjustment

What constitutes maladjustment for an individual is indicated by what has been said about personal adjustment. Maladjustment is a matter of degree, and some maladjustment is experienced by everyone. Obvious maladjustment is discerned by others when one behaves outwardly and so expresses himself as to depart far from or violate group expectations, and when one assumes roles that are inappropriate to his place in the community. Just as one may give the appearance of being well adjusted when his covert feelings and thoughts reflect maladjustment, so one may assume the outward appearance of being badly maladjusted while inwardly feeling confident and adequate in a social situation.

Covertly maladjustment seems to result when one's status is quite out of keeping with one's self-evaluation, or when the apparent attitude of others toward a person seems to be out of keeping with one's idea of how others should act toward him. Symptomatic of maladjustment are a lack of confidence and self-consciousness, desire to withdraw or escape from social situations, and distrust of others. These are feelings which everyone at some time shares, at times mildly, at others acutely. When they are the dominant feelings of individuals over any considerable time they become intolerable and lead to radical changes in adjustment techniques.

Social Utility of Maladjustment. Because personal experiences with maladjustment are painful there is a tendency to look upon all maladjustment as deplorable, overlooking the significant fact that some maladjustment serves a highly important social function. This may be seen especially in growing children, who are under the necessity of developing personalities even at considerable sacrifice to their whims and desires of the moment. Personality development requires of them efforts which are often difficult, and progressive self-denial. Except for the spur of frequent maladjustment to social situations, few persons would develop mature traits of thought, feeling, and behavior.

Such difficult steps of development as learning to speak, respecting the wishes of others, and denying one's self pleasures so that others may have enjoyment come about largely because the child is maladjusted at some stage of his socialization. The child who becomes too well adjusted at any stage of his or her maturation may simply remain at that stage of development, in many ways, and fail to "grow up" in a social sense.

What is obvious of the social utility of maladjustment in children is true, though to a lesser degree, in mature persons. The incentive which drives a man to seek a job when he is unemployed may be maladjustment at home and among his associates arising out of the condition of being unemployed. The efforts made by sick persons to regain health, the sacrifices made by parents for their children, and other efforts to carry on life routines usually are made under pain of the alternative of severe social maladjustment.

Extremes of Maladjustment. Personal maladjustment becomes a social problem when it reaches extremes and affects large numbers of people in such ways that they revert to modes of conduct and thinking that violate accepted standards of the group. Many types of pathological collective behavior are associated with widespread personal maladjustment. Fanatical movements and crazes, violence and rebellion, panic and rioting, hunger strikes and waves of suicide, all appear to have at their roots widespread personal frustration. In times of financial depression and unemployment, of war threats or famine, or when otherwise the lot of individuals becomes seemingly hopeless as far as normal modes of action are concerned, various kinds of abnormal crowd behavior are apt to occur.[4]

Less extreme symptoms of widespread personal maladjustment are modes of behavior which come well within social standards, although they are usually considered as "escapes" from the stress and strain of modern competitive life. These include participation in many kinds of passive amusements, from the excessive reading of "escape" literature to obsessive attendance at motion pictures. Even day dreaming in excess may be regarded as symptomatic of serious maladjustment.

Psychoses and Neuroses. Among the indications of the extent of maladjustment are the incidences of psychoses and neuroses in our culture group. The psychoses, or "insanities," which strike large numbers of people are of two recognized types—the organic and functional. The former are considered as the results of actual deterioration of the brain tissues and cells, and the latter are recognized as being radical efforts to adjust

[4] For an illustration, see H. Orlansky, *The Harlem Riot: A Study in Mass Frustration*, Social Analysis, New York, 1943.

to intolerable life conditions. Apparently the incidence of psychoses is higher among the more "civilized" peoples than among the less advanced, and many authorities think they are on the increase in our population. Their incidence increases with age; that is, they are found mainly among older people, and to a lesser extent among the young, which may account for an increase in our group in which the proportion of aged people is growing.

The functional psychoses, those without a clear basis in actual deterioration of the brain and nervous system, are largely curable at the present time. The organic psychoses are more resistant to treatment, and cures are fewer. A factor in the problem of controlling psychoses is the social stigma which attaches to persons who are afflicted and to members of their families, which is often an impediment to early recognition and treatment, and adequate provision of facilities for the care of such persons. The general trend, however, is toward a better understanding that psychoses are diseases to be dealt with and treated as other illness is.[5]

The psychoneuroses and neuroses are less serious manifestations of personal maladjustment than the insanities, but often are persistent and greatly handicap individuals in participation in group life. Because they are relatively mild in their effects, they are often ignored and go untreated. Their incidence seems to be greatest in times of crisis, especially during wartime, and many of them are associated with experiences in battle and in the more rigorous phases of training in the armed forces. But they have also been notable among civilian populations during time of war.[6]

Extreme indications of personal maladjustment are suicide and attempted suicide, and there are numerous studies of the incidence of suicide in populations at particular times. It seems that in times of social stress, such as economic depressions and following defeat in war, the number of suicides increases notably, and at times in history there have been waves of suicide that have swept countries and even large parts of the world.[7]

Societal Causation

Social scientists, generally are agreed that widespread personal maladjustment is a reflection of social disorganization. In well-organized and relatively static societies, life for the individual, no matter how difficult

[5] See Harvey Cleckley, "The Psychopath: A Problem for Society," and Ben Karpman, "A Yardstick for Measuring Psychopathy," both articles in *Federal Probation*, Vol. X, No. 4, 1946, pp. 22-31.

[6] S. K. Weinberg, "The Combat Neuroses," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LI, 1946, pp. 465-478.

[7] An example of these studies is Walter A. Lunden, "Suicides in France, 1910-43," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LII, 1947, pp. 321-334.

and mean, is predictable; and there is security of status, even though that status be low. In such societies there is usually a socially accepted fatalism which justifies the hard lot of the oppressed and a philosophy of acceptance of the roles and status to which a person is born. Under such conditions there is relatively little personal maladjustment.

In more complex and dynamic societies, and especially those which place emphasis upon individual self-determination, there is often much dissatisfaction and refusal to accept inferior positions and distasteful conditions. Where social mobility is great, and many persons move freely up and down the social scale, many taste the better things and higher positions that their group affords, only to lose them in adversity; and having experienced the better they rebel against a return to something which offers lower status and relatively inferior roles.

Social Change. Repeatedly it has been noted that social change is always strongly resisted because it threatens security of status for many people. Yet change must and does occur, and in our culture it takes place with bewildering rapidity. The roles and status of many people are affected as change occurs, and often the effect is to lower status or threaten security. This undoubtedly accounts for much of the personal maladjustment in our group, because nearly all persons live under the almost constant threat of lowered status and lessened security. At the onset of the depression of the 1930's it is notable that suicides were frequent among people who had achieved high status and wealth; these attainments, for a time, at least, had appeared to be secure, but overnight they were destroyed or brought under serious threat.

Although such effects of change come to general attention, it is probable that many more people become maladjusted through changes brought about by technology which tends to displace highly skilled workers by machines, and therefore to threaten their security—often the product of a lifetime of training and highly specialized experience.

Spatial mobility, like social mobility, may be an important phase of change contributing to personal maladjustment. When such mobility threatens the solidarity of families, or tends to isolate individuals from their accustomed communities and neighborhoods, it can place great strains upon personal integrity.

Conflicts in Standards. An important aspect of rapid social change is that it confronts individuals with inconsistent and conflicting standards of conduct. This is notably true as between older people in a population and the younger; the elders being inclined, usually, to cling to the *status quo* on which their security is based; whereas the younger people seek change which presumably will bring them greater opportunities for advance-

ment and improvement of their socio-economic positions. Thus, change may divide groups and bring conflicts in loyalties, which are distressing to many individuals.

The principal conflicts are found within individuals, rather than between and among them. It is normal for the individual to live mainly by habit, but when conditions change rapidly, habit may become quite inadequate for making adjustments to the world. Habit failing, it is comfortable and contributes to individual integrity if persons may fall back upon sure guides to behavior—guides which carry unquestioned moral weight and group approval. Thus, if persons know without doubt what is *right* and what is *wrong* in making choices that confront them, there need be no serious personal maladjustment, even though the *right* path may be difficult and distasteful.

But when conditions are such as they are apt to be in dynamic societies like our own, not only does habit often fail to bring suitable adjustments, but there may also be no clear-cut guides in group morality for choosing among alternatives. Under such circumstances expediency becomes the principal guide, and any choice may well prove to be an unwise one. In such circumstances, the very necessity of making choices can well be a source of personal maladjustment.[8]

Roots of Maladjustment

There is common agreement among the students of personal maladjustment, whether psychologists, psychiatrists, or social scientists, that the roots lie early in the developmental history of individuals; and usually the individual causation is sought in the formative childhood period. The precipitating causes which lie in social conditions and social change in themselves are insufficient to explain individual adjustment failures, because the same general conditions impinge upon large numbers of people at any time, and most of those who are thus affected manage to remain relatively normal as personalities. Just as the demands of modern group life are many and insistent, and the problems difficult, so are mature individuals, apparently, well equipped for meeting them. The fact that widespread, acute maladjustment remains the exceptional indicates that individual causes must be understood in order to completely understand the problems that arise.

Some combatants succumb to the strain of battle, but most do not; in civilian affairs, some yield to adversity and seek escape, but most people do not; and so it is throughout group life—the chronically maladjusted person remains the exception. The problem is why it is that

[8] For further analysis of this problem, see Paul Walter, Jr., "The Fields of Behavior," Chapter IV in J. S. Roucek and Associates, *Social Control*, D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.

those who do yield, and become the psychotic, neurotic, or less extremely affected, lack the resiliency necessary for meeting life conditions.

For an answer it is necessary to focus upon the early and formative years of life experience, and the closely knit intimate primary groups which are the matrix in which the basic personality is shaped. It is in such situations that individuals acquire the habits of thought and action, the attitudes and philosophies, which fit them or unfit them to meet later life crises. The meaning of maturity, in its social sense, is that persons have, by the time they have "grown up," become equipped for the strains which life is apt to impose upon them; and human history has shown that the adult human being, fully socialized, is usually remarkably "tough" even in the face of the greatest adversity and distress.

Just as recent wars have brought to attention alarmingly numerous cases of war neuroses among combatants and noncombatants, they have also made available many accounts of individuals who have undergone almost unbelievable hardships and deprivations, who have faced seemingly hopeless situations, and who have retained their normality as well-adjusted human beings.

Family Influence. In any consideration of the formative years in the lives of individuals, primacy must be given to family experiences and influences. These vary from family to family and individual to individual, but in a given culture group, as our own, they are still sufficiently uniform that we may make some generalizations regarding them.

From the standpoint of personality development in eras of rapid change, families are greatly handicapped because the training and molding of the young lies in the hands of adults whose orientation is to the past and present, largely, and for whom the future in which their children must live out their lives is largely a closed book. Under such conditions the only safe guide is the need for flexibility. Families whose patterns are very rigid are apt to train children who cannot readily adapt. On the other hand, as hundreds of cases of children who present behavior problems or become delinquent show, too much flexibility in patterns of family control leave children with little "character."

The child-centered small family unit of the present is apt to be strongly inclined to protect its children from the world, but over-protected children may be handicapped in later life when familial and parental protections are no longer available or adequate. Conversely, children without familial protection develop a sense of insecurity which may bring serious difficulties either during the childhood period or later in life.

Thus preparation of children for adequate life adjustment poses a number of delicate problems of proper balance between opposing needs.

and it is small wonder that failures in adequate personality development are frequent and numerous; rather it is impressive that most children become fairly well adjusted in later life, even to adversity and social crises.

Maladjustment and Age. It has been noted above that the incidence of psychoses becomes greater as one advances up the scale of age-groupings. The very old show the highest rates, whereas those of late middle life and approaching old age come next in the scale. This may be, in part, attributed to physiological deterioration and loss of capacities which individuals had earlier in life. Probably it is due, to a much greater extent, to the difficult position in which the aged find themselves in modern industrialized and urbanized societies.

Changing life conditions have made it increasingly less practicable for the small family unit to care adequately for its aged members, and there has been in recent decades a declining respect for the old because of their age. Thus the aged are apt to find their position as regards both economic and associational security a precarious one that contributes greatly to their problems and is a cause of much worry.

In addition the general economy, in which most people find their place in our society, tends increasingly to expose the older workers to direct competition both from machines and from younger workers, so that a lifetime spent in learning a skill and acquiring experience is no longer a guarantee of status and continued employment. It is true that there are more and more types of security available to many aged persons through annuities, insurance, industrial pensions, and Social Security, but even such benefits mean, usually, a considerable decline in the economic scale, and almost complete loss of status.

The aged, too, have much more immediate and insistent worries about their health and physical well-being than do others in group life, and therefore must continuously face problems that most others can, at least temporarily, ignore.

Maladjustment of Adolescents. Much has been written about the adjustment problems of adolescents (those between the onset of puberty and full maturity), an age-group of indefinite limits, which also seems to have a relatively high incidence of maladjustment. Various interpretations have been placed upon such problems, but the principal causes seem obvious. In our culture we tend to concentrate the crises of life in a single brief period, forcing upon individuals, who are poorly prepared by training or experience to make them, a number of choices which will affect their entire futures.

Most mature adults, with their greater background of experience and knowledge, would find it a severe strain if they had within a short period of time to decide upon their life philosophy, choose their careers, make decisions as to whether or not to marry and have children, and if they decide to marry, to select and attempt to secure a desired mate. Yet we do insistently force upon adolescents approaching maturity these and other serious choices, at the same time impressing upon them that mistakes will be fatal to future happiness.

As a rule when adolescents are faced with such important decisions they are still mainly accustomed to having their choices and decisions in important matters made for them, and to devoting themselves to the enjoyment of the moment. The sudden transition apparently accounts for the maladjustments which occur during such critical years as the last terms of high school and the college years.

Summary

Personality, from the social science point of view, is the product of experience in association with others in organized group life. It is complex and variable. Personality adjustment and maladjustment are matters of degree. All personalities are somewhat maladjusted, and, indeed, some maladjustment serves a useful social purpose in that it is the incentive which leads individuals to make the efforts and sacrifices of self-interest necessary to becoming fully socialized. It is the extremes of maladjustment that constitute a social problem, for when many members of a group are badly maladjusted they become a fertile field for the inauguration of various kinds of crazes and fanatical movements.

Types of extremely maladjusted persons include psychotics, neurotics, and psychoneurotics, who may resort to abnormal behavior to escape from intolerable social situations. They also include the more acceptable type of persons who constantly seek temporary escape in literature, motion pictures, and other kinds of passive commercial amusements.

Causes of widespread personal maladjustment are cultural, and may thus be understood. Each culture provides for the training of members for social participation in manners which meet with group expectations. There are some individuals who obviously lack the capacities necessary for such training; but more numerous are cases where the training fails for some reason to produce the type of mature social member that it is intended to produce. There are also, in rapidly changing and heterogeneous cultures such as our own, numerous instances in which group expectations and social standards are inconsistent and even conflicting, and in such cases no amount of efficient training can prevent a relatively large amount of personal and social maladjustment.

Terms

Functional insanity
Psychiatric
Personality
Human nature
Identity
Status
Integrity
Maturation
Group expectation
Reflected self
Realized self
Psychoneuroses
Escape

Questions

1. How is personality developed?
2. What is the social utility of personal maladjustment?
3. What are some of the extreme types of maladjustment?
4. Which age groups are apt to have high incidences of personal maladjustment? Why?
5. What is the significance of the family in relation to personal adjustment or maladjustment?
6. What causes of widespread maladjustment lie in the larger society?

READING LIST

Harold H. Anderson, *Children in the Family*. D. Appleton-Century Co., 1941.

Therese Benedek, *Insight and Personality Adjustment: A Study of the Psychological Effects of War*. Ronald Press, 1946.

M. C. Elmer, *Family Adjustment and Social Change*. Farrar & Rinehart, 1932.

Arnold Gesell and Frances L. Ilg, *Infant and Child in the Culture of Today*. Harper & Bros., 1943.

Oscar J. Kaplan, *Mental Disorders in Later Life*. Stanford University Press, 1945.

Harriet Mowrer, *Personality Adjustment and Domestic Discord*. American Book Co., 1935.

Gardner Murphy, *Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure*. Harper & Bros., 1947.

James D. Page, *Abnormal Psychology*. Prentice Hall, 1947.

E. B. Reuter, "The Sociology of Adolescence," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XLIII, 1937, pp. 414-427.

CHAPTER XIII

Competition and Business Enterprise

In modern advanced cultures much of the energy and thought of people is absorbed in economic activities, and many of the perplexing problems of individuals and groups lie in this area. Getting and keeping a job, establishing and maintaining a business, paying bills and trying to save for the future, and getting ahead financially so preoccupy many persons that they have relatively little time or consideration for other phases of living. Economic criteria have become widely accepted as measurements of general well-being, social status, individual and group abilities, and "progress."

Our own culture regards as normal and fitting the carrying on of these activities within what we call "free enterprise capitalism." Our economy is actually a mixture of many types of economic organization and behavior, some of which come well within the definitions of free enterprise and capitalism, and others of which depart far from it, but our thinking is largely in terms of such a general scheme.

In free enterprise capitalism, the individual is presumably free to decide upon whether or not he shall engage in economic activities, and if so, in what way. He may presumably sell his services or not as he wishes, or produce and sell the kind of goods he wishes in the amount he desires, and on such terms as he may deem most compatible with his own best interests. There is a minimum of external control over his economic behavior.

Capitalism is a system that emphasizes the importance of economic capital—that is, the tools, instruments, and plants necessary for industrial or other production. So important is capital regarded that it takes precedence over other factors of production, such as land and labor. Capital can only be provided if people are willing to postpone immediate wants in order to get larger possible future gains, and take the risks that the hope of future gains entails. Thus there must be powerful incentives to bring about saving and capital accumulation, and these take the form of interest and profit, or appeals to the "profit motive."

Competition Among Individuals

The free enterprise capitalistic system is one that is grounded in competition among individuals; and, basically, such competition is relied upon to maintain an equilibrium which makes the vast cooperative efforts of our economy possible. The competition starts with the fact that each individual has infinite wants for material things and the services of others; and the companion fact that the supplies of both goods and services are limited. Therefore, it follows that each person may not have all he wants, and he must compete with other individuals for the fulfillment of any of his economic desires. If he wants food, so does every other person, but there is not enough for all to have all the food they want, so competition results. The same is true of houses, automobiles, and any of the other things that people desire.

Areas of Individual Competition. Competition may be seen in the smallest and most basic of social organizations—families. Each member of the family has wants that to some extent conflict with the wants of other members of the family. It matters little at which economic level the family may live, there is still an element of competition among its various members for goods and services, in which the success of one member in gaining his ends necessarily results in others being deprived of things or services that they may want. At the family level, quite usually, the competition is mild and sublimated, but frequently it may be so intense as to disrupt family ties or be a constant source of friction.

Outside the family, individuals are constantly competing with others for economic ends. The wage earner of the family must compete with others for a job, or for a better position if he has a job. The housewife must compete with other housewives in the market to purchase the food and other necessities and luxuries for her family. Members of the family must compete with members of other families for the prestige that comes with having better appearing homes, costlier automobiles, and other marks of distinction by which status is usually acquired. Children compete with other children in school, whether in the classroom or on the playground.

Political activities are a large area of individual competition both for prestige and for economic values. Political organizers compete with other organizers, candidates compete with candidates, office holders compete with other office holders or with aspirants for their offices. In the realm of sports, not only is there competition between teams, but also between individuals for positions on teams and for the acclaim of spectators and publics. Motion picture actors compete with other actors, authors compete with authors, and scientists compete with other scientists. In no

realm is the element of personal competition entirely absent, and, in societies such as our own, there is nearly always an economic element involved in the competition.

Inter-Group Competition. Personal competition at times transcends, at others is subordinated to, competition between and among groups. Usually the competition among members of a family, members of a business organization, members of a team, or members of other groups is subordinated to competition at the group level. The competition among groups may be found in every phase of organized group life—between churches, schools or colleges, clubs, neighborhoods, communities, political parties, and nations, but nowhere is it so well exemplified and accepted as necessary as in the field of business activities.

In the strictly economic realm there are many areas of competition. One is the competition between groups of workers and groups of employers, with the complication that labor groups compete with other labor groups, and employer groups compete with other employer groups. Each business organization competes with rival business organizations. Whole industries may compete with other industries. Producers of one nation may engage in organized competition with rival producers of other nations; and nations themselves may compete in the economic arena.

Functions of Competition. The competitive nature of economic activities serves a number of social functions in our society. Whether at the individual or group level, competition calls forth greater efforts, and therefore results in greater production. It serves to induce individuals and groups to subordinate lesser competitions to competitive needs at higher levels, as when competing workmen strive together that their organization may better compete with other organizations, or when individual proprietors work together that their industry may better compete with another industry.

Competition tends not only to increase effort and production, but it may result in better quality of products and services, since in the general competition those who produce the best quality may have an advantage, and others must approach their standards to remain effective competitors. Each competing individual or organization is constantly seeking new ways to improve quality in order to have an advantage over competitors, and thus innovations result more rapidly than they would in the absence of competition.

In competition lie effective controls over prices for much the same reasons that quality improvements result. To sell goods or services for lower prices gives a person or organization a competitive advantage, so

that generally, as a result of competition the price level tends to be lower, which means that economic goods become accessible to more and more people, and general living levels rise.

That these functions are not always efficiently served in a competitive economy results from many problems and complications which arise, and from the fact that competition is never completely unrestricted.

Restrictions on Competition. Unlimited competition, either at the individual level or between and among groups, would be disastrous to an economy. It would preclude cooperative efforts, and most of the world's work is done by cooperation among persons and groups. As has been demonstrated repeatedly in economic history, completely unrestricted competition eventually is destructive of the competitors, or most of them, and thus becomes, for the few survivors, monopoly, or the absence of effective competition. Two men competing for the same job, if there are no restrictions, may continue to underbid each other until one works for so little that he cannot maintain himself and the other goes jobless. Two businesses may so far reduce prices in their competition that one or both become insolvent and cease to function.

Everywhere in our economy there are restrictions on competition. The most obvious are those already mentioned, where the competition at various levels becomes subordinated, and therefore sublimated, because of the demands of competition at a higher level. The individual worker may restrict his own competitive activities because he is a member of a labor union, or because of the interests of the company for which he works. A particular business enterprise may limit its competitive activities in the interest of a community or because it belongs to a trade organization. Such limitations might be considered as rational limitations, in which the best interests of a person or organization are obviously served by subordinating competitive striving to cooperative efforts.

Also obvious as a limitation on competition are formal laws promulgated and enforced by governments. Many municipal governments have seen fit to grant and enforce virtual monopolies to public utility companies in order to insure efficient and cheap service for citizens. Governments may regulate railway rates and standards of service, prohibit extension of existing lines, and in other ways limit competition. They may from time to time fix prices, or set minimum or maximum charges to temper competitive practices.

Formal organization within industries or among workers may serve to limit competition. Labor organizations restrict competition among members for jobs and preference. All industries are organized to some extent to limit competitive practices. In some countries such organization is much more far-reaching than in our own, but at times it has been an

important factor in the United States, as during the recovery phase of the business cycle during the 1930's when the government, under the National Recovery Act encouraged such formal organization.

Private Agreements. Usually frowned upon in our economy but frequently used are private agreements between individual proprietors or companies to limit their competition in certain regards. Often such agreements are regarded as "restraint of trade," especially if they are agreements which effectively keep prices at higher levels than would prevail under freer competition between or among the parties to the agreements.[1]

Much more subtle are the informal understandings among individuals and groups as to what constitutes fair competitive practices, and conversely, those which are unfair. Some forms of advertising, radical price cutting, extreme criticism of a competitor's products or services, and the use of violence for competitive purposes are usually condemned in such understandings. In every community there are organizations among business men and industrialists that serve both the purposes of congeniality and of reinforcing the folkways and mores of limited competitive enterprise. Examples are Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce.

Through these means and others, competition is always limited to some extent, so that the functions which competition ideally serves in the economy are imperfectly accomplished out of deference to other purposes which are considered of greater importance. In some cases the functions of competition are so completely thwarted that the interests of the economy or segments of it are sacrificed.

Business Enterprise

Seldom in our economy is business enterprise carried on by an individual working alone, although many firms are financed by individual enterprisers. In almost all cases it is an activity of an organization. The organizations that carry on business enterprises vary from giant concerns in which thousands of persons combine their efforts and resources, to very small enterprises in which a few individuals, two, three, or a dozen, are engaged. Increasingly the trend is toward a greater concentration of business enterprise in large corporations. Business enterprises may be operated by individual enterprisers, by partners, or as corporations. In some cases they are governmentally owned and operated.

[1] In connection with laws which forbid combinations in restraint of trade, the Supreme Court has adopted what is called the "rule of reason," that is, the recognition that many practices restrain trade but that those which the Congress has meant to outlaw are these which constitute an "unreasonable" restraint.

The Individual Enterpriser. Most usually found in small enterprises is the individual enterpriser. This is a single person who supplies the capital, accepts the risks, employs the necessary workers, and engages in furnishing goods or services to consumers. The size of operations is limited by the resources at the command of the individual and by the extent to which he will risk those resources. He accepts the full responsibility and expects to reap the full profit from his undertaking. Matters of policy are determined by the individual. Usually he engages actively as a worker in his enterprise.

Most of the farming of this country is carried on by individual enterprisers, and both the attractions and disadvantages of farming are related to this fact. Although the individual enterprise offers a certain freedom of action and full reward for successful operation, usually the individual finds himself at a disadvantage in competition with larger and stronger business units. He usually exercises less control over the markets in which he must buy and sell his goods.

The Partnership. The individual may increase his resources greatly by entering into partnership with one or more persons. In so doing he gains advantages of the knowledge and other talents of his partners, as well as the increased resources they make possible. But he loses a part of his policy-making power and freedom of action and is under the necessity of sharing profits.

In many areas of our economy the advantages of partnership have so outweighed its disadvantages that it has become a widely used type of business organization. Its wide use has led to its recognition in laws which define the rights, duties, and responsibilities of partners. Under these laws partners may be required to give accountings to each other of the operation of their business, and conditions are provided under which partnerships may, or must, be dissolved. Usually under such laws each partner is held fully responsible for the debts and other obligations of the business enterprise.

While the partnership form may be, and is, used for every type of business undertaking, it is most prevalent in firms that engage in professional or quasi-professional services. In every community examples may readily be found in law firms, real estate and insurance agencies, and among physicians.

The Corporation. Much larger pools of capital are possible through the form of business organization known as the corporation. There is no definite limit on the number of partners in partnerships, but practical considerations keep them relatively few. In corporations, dozens, hundreds, and even thousands of individuals may bring together a part of

their resources and conduct business undertakings on a far greater scale than is usually possible for either individual enterprisers or partners. Even for smaller undertakings requiring relatively little capital there are many advantages in the corporation. One is limited liability. Where the partner or individual enterpriser is liable for all debts and obligations of a business enterprise, in most forms of corporation each shareholder is exempt from loss beyond that of his original investment. A further advantage lies in the relatively stable character of corporations, which may exist over long periods of time regardless of whether the individual shareholders remain in the firm or live or die. The business of an individual enterpriser cannot outlive him, and that of a partnership usually must cease or reorganize on the demise or withdrawal of a single partner. This means that the corporation has advantages in borrowing funds for operating purposes because of the greater certainty of continued operation.

For the reasons enumerated, and others, the corporation has become the principal form of business organization except in a few fields such as farming. It is used to carry on small and large undertakings, and its trend is chiefly in the direction of ever larger business units. Certain advantages lie with large business units. They usually can afford the services of experts in their management and operations, they have the advantages in buying raw materials and equipment that go with large-scale purchases, and they have thorough knowledge of the market in which they are buying. They have also the advantages which go with size in bargaining with workers. Their advantage is especially great in selling their products over larger areas and through partly controlled sales channels. They can accumulate larger reserves in anticipation of business reverses.

The Super-Corporation. So obvious and many are the advantages of large business units that many ways have been found of combining corporations into what may realistically be called super-corporations. The trust, the holding company, and in some countries, the cartel have brought into single business operating units large numbers of corporations that engage in the same or in different types of enterprises. The United States Steel Corporation, which is a holding company controlling many corporations, conducts operations including mining, transportation, iron production, steel production, and the manufacture and sale of finished products.

The super-corporations have come to dominate many fields of business activity in our economy. In many cases they represent capital pools running into billions of dollars, they employ tens of thousands of workers; and they are under the nominal control of hundreds of thousands

of stockholders. Their very size has made them points of concentration of power, both economic and political, which are often considered dangerous to effective democracy; and this has led to governmental control of many phases of their activities.

The Growth of Monopoly

Many problems have arisen both with the development of the corporate form of business enterprise, and more especially with the trend toward ever larger units of business organization. Usually the problems are summed up as a tendency toward monopoly controls, sometimes as a deliberate policy, usually as an inevitable accompaniment of great size.

Very large business units can and do control the sources of raw materials to the extent that competitive processes do not work effectively to regulate prices paid for such materials. They may also so dominate the market for their goods and service that competition is sometimes defeated as a regulator of price and quality. This tends to work to the disadvantage of smaller business enterprises and often drives them from competitive fields.

Although the shareholders or nominal owners of great corporations may run into many thousands of people, which, on the face of it, would indicate a large degree of democratic control, actually, in most such huge organizations the real control is in the hands of very few individuals. The shareholders are scattered over the entire country, they have little knowledge of the details of operation of the company and neither time nor means to engage actively in running the business. If they vote at all in shareholder meetings, which are held once a year, they usually do so by proxy, that is, by authorizing others to vote their shares for them. A few persons owning a minority of the stock, but with the time and means for engaging actively in the management of the business, may effectively control a corporation's policies and activities.

The persons who control a corporation usually have considerable interests in other corporations which they also may control, and thus a relatively small number of men of financial means may control not one, but a number of different corporations.[2] This tendency greatly intensifies the problems of concentrated economic and political power.

There is a long history of efforts of governments to limit the growth of such concentrations of power and the monopoly tendencies of large-scale business enterprises. In our own country there have been many laws enacted at different times, by states and the national government, which would place obstacles in the way of the development of

2 National Resources Committee, *The Structure of the American Economy*, Government Printing Office, 1939.

giant business enterprises, and which give to governmental agencies regulatory powers to limit, or even to dissolve monopolistic business organizations. Although these laws have been effective in preventing some extremes, the general trend toward concentration in the economic world continues.

Public Utilities. In general, in our economy, government policy may be said to oppose monopoly in principle, but it must be noted that in some cases governmental units have encouraged, and even created monopolies. The outstanding examples in this regard are public utilities, or those types of enterprise supplying services and goods which are considered so vital to entire communities that their supply cannot be left entirely to free competitive initiative.

Usually considered as public utilities are water supplies, services to dispose of garbage and other waste, the supplying of electricity and gas, and local transportation. Such services must be made available on dependable schedules and at a price within the reach of nearly all persons and families if communities are to exist. Historically, each of these services was at one time a matter of free competitive enterprise, but with the growth of communities it was found that under such conditions the needs of people were inadequately served, and the tendency was toward monopoly controls which worked to the disadvantage of consumers.

Increasingly it became the policy of local governmental units to grant more or less exclusive franchises to corporations to serve these needs. The franchises give to corporations, in return for some financial consideration, right to use city streets and alleys for laying tracks, installing pipe lines or electric lines, and other purposes necessary to carrying out their functions efficiently from the point of view of service to the entire community. They also give a right of eminent domain, by which, upon a showing of necessity, the corporation may take over or use land belonging to individuals.

In return for franchises, the governmental unit sets conditions and standards of service which the corporation must meet, and assumes wide powers of regulation of rates and other phases of the operation of the franchised business. Thus, the public utility, even though privately owned and managed, is, in effect, a monopoly in most cases, and is also closely regulated by government.

Public Enterprises. For the same reasons that special status is granted public utility corporations by governmental units, many governments, especially at the municipal level, have themselves become owners and operators of business enterprises. The most numerous examples are in municipally owned water systems, gas and electric plants, and street

transportation systems. When governmental units engage in such enterprises they sell the services to consumers in much the same manner as do privately owned utility companies. There is more concern with efficient service and low rates, usually, than with profitable operation. When such public enterprises are profitable the profits may be reflected in lower rates of taxation, greater expenditures for other public purposes, or both.

From early in our history, and increasingly, the Federal government has also been engaged in public enterprises. The principal historical and present example is the post office, which is a huge business selling services that might be considered in the same category with those services sold by public utilities. The post office is virtually a monopoly, but is one which concerns itself chiefly with service at low cost rather than with profits, so that usually it operates at a loss which must be made up from tax receipts.

Some governmental enterprises compete directly or indirectly with privately owned enterprises. The government operates loan agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the several agencies that give credit to farm operators and buyers of homes in competition with banks; through the Social Security agencies it competes, to some extent, with insurance companies. The Federal government engages in large construction projects through the Bureau of Reclamation, in forestry through the Forest Service, and rents public lands to livestock growers.

During time of war the Federal government expands its business enterprises and often enters as sole operator or partner into many kinds of productive enterprises which are necessary to a complete war effort. At all times it must maintain some few productive enterprises as a constant preparation for possible wars.

Multiple-Purpose Projects. A somewhat recent development has been the multiple-purpose projects of the Federal government, which have caused much controversy because they enter into competition, often, with private enterprises. The multiple-purpose project is one which usually covers an entire river drainage, and includes flood control dams and other works, drainage, irrigation, and navigation developments, as well as the generation of electric power. It may also include soil conservation work, limited manufacturing, and even housing programs.

Most notable and controverted of such projects has been the Tennessee Valley Authority which grew out of a manufacturing enterprise to supply materials needed for war preparedness, but which was expanded to include the other types of undertakings that have been enumerated. In its manufacture of electrical power and its sale to consumers over a wide

area, the project came into competition with privately owned power companies. It became a part of its policy to set up a "yardstick" by which it was presumed that proper rates at which electricity should be supplied to consumers might be measured.

A number of other similar large-scale undertakings have been proposed, and some others have been constructed. Should many of the others which are proposed be built, it would represent a considerable extension of governmental economic activities that would have important effects upon the entire economy.

Governmental Enterprise Abroad. Even though there has been a trend toward more and more governmental activity in fields that previously had been considered exclusive realms of private enterprise, it has been general policy of governments in this country to respect private enterprise and to refrain from many kinds of business activities which other governments have seen fit to enter. Many national governments have established government monopolies in some commodities that are in common demand, such as tobacco, chiefly because of the revenue which comes from such monopolies. Under socialism, it is deliberate policy for governments to gain control over key industries and fields of enterprise, as in the case of England in recent years; or the much more complete extension of government ownership, as in the Soviet Union.

Under Fascism, the policy has been to extend government controls over large industries and key enterprises, but not through outright government ownership in most cases. A more usual means has been through government partnership with private owners in such enterprises.[3]

Although there is usually controversy in detailed application, in this country it is generally thought that governmental units may and should enter the fields of business enterprises only to produce goods and supply services that are essential to general welfare which private enterprises cannot or may not be depended upon to furnish.

Cooperatives

Of increasing importance in our economy has been the growth and development of a form of business enterprise known as the cooperative. The cooperative takes the form of a corporation with some departures from the more usual corporate organization. Chief among these is that the shareholders, or owners, of the enterprise have one vote each, instead of as many votes as they have shares of stock. Since most cooperatives are relatively small, having few shareholders who usually reside close

[3] Ralph H. Blodgett, *Comparative Economic Systems*, The Macmillan Co., 1944, Chapter XXV.

together, this modification gives a more democratic control of policies and activities than does the more usual practice of corporations of voting according to stock ownership.[4]

Cooperatives may serve any or several of a number of functions. The consumer cooperative operates stores or service stations where the owners and other persons may purchase goods. Usually it pays a patronage refund on all goods purchased to those who buy them, thus permitting them to share in the profits of the enterprise, as well as to get dependably graded goods of known quality. Other cooperatives engage in selling goods, especially agricutural products, so that small individual operators may have the advantages of large-scale enterprise without losing their independence, and may share the profits of the marketing enterprise as well as the return which ordinarily would come to them as producers. Still other cooperatives, known as credit unions, make available to the owners of the enterprise small loans in time of need without exorbitant interest or fear of exploitative practices which are often associated with such loans.

In some other countries, notably England and the Scandinavian countries, cooperatives have had a much greater growth, comparatively, than in the United States, and they constitute a considerably larger part of the entire economy. They are looked upon by their supporters as one way in which the essentials of free enterprise may be retained but the abuses which have often accompanied free enterprise may be avoided. It has been the policy of the Federal government in this country to lend some support to the development of cooperatives, especially among farmers, by assisting in the initial organizational work, making loans available at low interest rates, and by some degree of tax exemption.

The Consumer

Some impetus to the cooperative movement in this and other countries has come from recognition of the disadvantaged position of the consumer in a free enterprise economy. Although other elements in the economy are highly organized, there is little effective organization among consumers for protection of their interests. In most exchange transactions in which ultimate consumers are involved, the seller sets the price and other conditions of the transaction. Although the seller must regard the desires of consumers in the mass in order to remain in business, in any individual transaction the individual consumer has little influence.

With the vast array of goods and services to be bought and sold,

[4] The cooperative movement is based upon the Rochdale principles, which, among other things, set up the voting plan for shareholders. See Maxwell Stewart, *Co-Operatives in the U. S.—A Balance Sheet,* Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 32, 1939.

and the complexity of the processes and materials which go into goods, few consumers are able to keep themselves informed on the actual quality or quantity of what they buy. They must rely upon labeling and advertising which may be quite misleading.

Government units at all levels find it necessary, in order to safeguard health and for other considerations, to enact and enforce many kinds of regulations to protect consumers from some of the more obvious dangers of their lack of information regarding what they buy. Especially is this true in connection with foods and drugs where standards set by law and regular inspections are considered necessary. Beyond such services which relate to the protection of health and safety, there has been strong resistance to further governmental regulation of quality and quantities of goods sold.

The Consumer Movement. Although consumer organization is quite limited in scope, there has been a growing consumer movement in this country. The movement includes the development of the consumer cooperative, organizations which support independent research agencies to test and measure packaged goods, and a general educational campaign designed to keep the consumer more realistically informed than he can be when his sole reliance is upon advertising, labels, and the claims of salesmen.

One reason for the slow development of the consumer movement is that nearly all consumers in our economy either are also producers, or are closely dependent upon producers for their financial support. This tends to bring about conflicting interests; and usually the persons confronted with this conflict have considered it to their advantage to give precedence to their productive interests over their interests as consumers. Completely informed consumers with thoroughly rational buying habits would mean a considerable change in our whole economy and might adversely affect the livings of a great many people.

Depersonalization of Relations

One of the long-run trends in our economy and in others which have developed in similar manner has been the progressive depersonalization of economic relations. In small communities where economic operations are few and simple the personal element enters largey into all business transactions. Much of the reliance for fair dealing in such transactions is based upon the known integrity of the persons with whom one is dealing, and all manner of personal considerations may enter to shape the details of business dealings.

Urbanization, increased mobility of goods and persons, and the increasing complexity of all business enterprise have worked progressively to reduce personal considerations. Transactions, typically, are between virtual strangers who have little accurate knowledge of each other. They are largely carried on over considerable distances and involve many interdependent steps. This may be seen in a wide range of business relationships. The owners of a large corporation not only may have no personal contact with the wage earners who work for the company, but may have no notion of the conditions under which they work, the wage agreements under which they are employed, or even of the nature of the work performed. The maker of goods quite probably has no personal knowledge of the consumers of the goods. Even those who perform personal services for people may know those people only as a succession of passing strangers.

This depersonalization of relations has led to the development of a large number of standardized procedures for conducting various types of business enterprises, which have grown out of trial-and-error experimentation, and which, when highly successful in bringing about profitable results, have often become virtually ritualized. Salesmen who cannot personally know the persons they will approach place reliance in a more or less set sales "talk." Business letters follow set forms. Credit arrangements, contract forms, insurance policies, and other kinds of business papers represent extremes in standardization. Even advertising, whether by radio, newspaper, magazine, or billboard, reflects close adherence to established patterns.

Another effect of depersonalization is that much misunderstanding and conflict arises among persons having seemingly adverse interests. It is almost impossible for the directors of a large corporation to grasp fully the point of view of the members of the labor force, or for the manufacturer of soaps to understand completely the problems of the housewives who buy his soaps.

Because many judgments of all persons engaged in economic transactions must be based upon predictions of the behavior of people whom they do not and cannot know personally, they must rely upon services of others who specialize in systematic study of particular modes of the behavior of the kinds of people with whom transactions must be made. Specialists study the buying habits of housewives, personnel managers study behavior patterns or workers, research organizations of various kinds study reading habits of magazine subscribers, preferences in size and shape of packaged consumer goods, etc. The entire business organization of the country has become highly dependent upon such services in order to have some contact, though indirect, with persons who enter into business transactions.

The Role of Government

Governmental organizations are important financial institutions, large employers of workers, important consumers of goods and services, and, as has been indicated, are becoming increasingly important as producers of goods and services. For these reasons the relations of government to the general economy are vital to the welfare of all persons engaged in economic activities. The government also has the power to enact and enforce laws, to enforce contractual arrangements, to limit and protect rights in property, to levy taxes on business enterprises, to set standards, prices, and wages, and otherwise to influence economic activities. So important are these governmental functions that, even in our free enterprise system, governmental units may create or destroy particular business firms or entire industries. Such effects may come about through deliberate policies of government, or through unwise policies or unwise application of policies where the purpose is quite different from the result achieved.

The modern science of economics had its beginning and has largely developed from concern of those engaged in economic activities over the proper role of government in economic affairs. Even before the time of Adam Smith, who is generally considered the originator of modern economics, there were controversies over the extent to which a government might wisely and properly dominate the activities of business enterprise. Smith's theory, later developed and modified by other theorists, recognized some necessary economic functions of government and the need for government to serve as a referee in the competition of the market place, but in general it held that in the long run greater benefits accrued both to the economy and the government if governments refrained from unnecessary interference with business activities.

The general notion that government should limit itself to strictly necessary controls over business enterprise, usually referred to as the laissez-faire doctrine, was adopted by liberals and became the dominant theme of economists in England, the United States, and other similar countries. Many changes in the nature of economic activity, however, have brought a continuous increase in governmental regulation of economic activities and have resulted in considerable changes in theory regarding the role of government. It is interesting to note that those who now consider themselves liberals usually favor greater government interference and an increase in the range of public enterprises, an almost complete reversal of the earlier liberal attitude.

Certainly under present conditions there is no simple rule-of-thumb which can adequately state the proper or wise relationship which gov-

ernments should maintain with business enterprise. In many areas the distinction between government and business has become undefinable. The problem of the relations between government and business can no longer be considered a general problem to which there is a general answer, but each case depends upon the particular situation, the time, and place in which it arises.

Summary

The American economy is formally described as a free enterprise capitalistic system, in distinction to other systems which are known as state capitalism, socialist, and communistic economy. Actually, the American economy is a complex mixture of a number of different systems, each having some characteristics which differentiate it from others—big business, small business, public utilities, public enterprises, agriculture, and cooperatives.

In theory, our economic system leaves it to the operation of free competition to establish and maintain economic equilibrium and to govern the volume of production and consumption through variations in price levels. As the industrial revolution has progressed in this country and economic relations have become more complex, the workings of competition have become restricted in many ways. Competition between individual and individual has become largely subordinated to competition between organizations of individuals; and that between business firm and business firm has been subordinated to other and higher levels of competition, or tempered by formal and informal understandings and agreements, and, to some extent, by law.

A critical problem throughout our history, and one around which economic thinking has been developed, is that of the proper relation of governmental controls to economic activities. The long-run general trend has been in the direction of increasing governmental regulation and participation in economic realms, ranging from a former position of passive referee to a much more active and positive role as regulator and guide to our economy.

Terms

Free enterprise
Capitalism
Capital
Sublimate
Monopoly
Enterpriser
Partnership
Corporation
Super-corporation
Public utility
Franchise
Public enterprise
Cooperative

Questions

1. What are examples of different levels of competition?
2. Why does the trend toward monopoly constitute a social problem?
3. Why is competition among individuals usually subordinated to competition among organizations?
4. What are the principal forms of business enterprise? What are the advantages and limitations of each?
5. How does competition affect prices and quality of goods? Why?
6. What has been the long-term trend in thinking about the role of government in the economy?

READING LIST

T. W. Arnold, *The Folklore of Capitalism.* Yale University Press, 1937.

William B. Benton, "The Economics of a Free Society," *Fortune,* Vol. XXX, October, 1944, pp. 163ff.

A. R. Burns, *The Decline of Competition.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936.

Lester V. Chandler, *A Preface to Economics.* Harper Bros., 1947.

R. A. Dixon, *Economic Institutions and Cultural Change.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941.

T. C. Mills, "Economics in Time of Change," *American Economic Review,* XXXI, March, 1940, pp. 1-14.

National Resources Planning Committee, *The Structure of the American Economy.* Government Printing Office, 1939.

E. R. Walker, *From Economic Theory to Policy.* University of Chicago Press, 1944.

CHAPTER XIV

Labor Problems

The production of goods and services occurs when human labor, equipped with tools, is applied to natural resources, all of which are referred to in economics as the factors of production. The names usually applied to these factors are land, labor, and capital. In this usage of the terms, land refers not only to actual footage or acreage, but also to the raw materials which come from nature, usually through extractive operations such as farming or mining. Labor refers to the human efforts, both physical and mental, which make land and natural resources into useful articles for human use. Capital refers to the tools, machines, and equipment which labor uses to bring about efficient production. It is necessary, in order that all three factors may be accessible in our free enterprise system, that each receive a share of the returns from the productive enterprise; and it is in the division of such returns among the factors that labor problems have their roots.

Rent, Interest, and Wages. The return that goes to those who supply the land (in the broad sense of the term) is called rent. When used in this sense, the term "rent" includes royalties and other fees paid for raw materials. Since the sources of supply of raw materials are owned, the owners have the option of making these raw materials and land space available for productive use or of withholding them until a future time. Land does not deteriorate rapidly, as a rule, and often increases in value simply with the passage of time. It is necessary, then, that those who would engage in production, and who therefore need space and natural resources, must bargain with the owners of land and offer them rent as an inducement to get them to supply that which is needed at the time for production.

Thus, in our economy, rent is a necessary cost of operation and a source of income for those who receive it. The amounts they receive depend upon the type of resources they furnish and its accessibility; and in the case of land space, it depends upon location, terrain, and other variables. As in the case of all things that are regularly bought and sold, there is usually a prevailing price which is arrived at in competi-

tive processes in the land market where those having land and those seeking land bargain.

What is true of land is also true of capital. To engage in production it is necessary to have some equipment in the form of tools and machinery. Since the actual equipment can be purchased, the term capital usually refers to the funds to be used to make such purchases. Those who furnish such funds are as necessary to the productive process as are those who supply land. They also have the option of furnishing money for equipment for a particular enterprise, or of withholding it, or of placing it in an alternative investment. Thus it is necessary for those who plan productive enterprises to offer an inducement to the possessors of capital, or the money with which machinery may be bought, and this inducement is called interest.

Interest is a necessary part of the expense of production. Since the money to purchase the tools of production is fluid and quite uniform in kind in a given economy, the problem of bargaining is greatly simplified. There are prevailing rates of interest which vary relatively little from place to place within the same economic sphere. These rates, like other prices, are fixed in the competitive processes of the market place where those seeking capital and those having surplus funds bargain, although, in the case of interest, there are apt to be also legal controls over interest rates.

Finally, there is the third factor of production, labor. It always requires human efforts to use capital and produce from land. Labor may be supplied to or withheld from particular enterprises by individual workers. Those who would engage in production must offer an inducement to labor, just as they must offer inducements to land and capital. In this case, the inducement is called wages. Like interest and rent, wages are a necessary expense in production. Without wages there would be no labor in a free economy and, therefore, no production.

The Risk Bearer. If left to chance, the three factors of production would seldom unite in a workable combination for productive purposes. Someone must plan to bring them together and make arrangements for the proper proportion of each to bring about results in the form of goods and services. The production of goods is never instantaneous; there is always a time lag between the beginning of the productive process and the reaping of returns. There are many elements in the process which are doubtful, and therefore the outcome, in terms of financial return, is always somewhat unpredictable. This all means that there is always involved an element of risk. It is the function of the entrepreneur, or risk bearer, to bring the factors together and assume this risk.

The risk bearer, like those who supply the factors of production, may enter into a productive enterprise or not as he sees fit. If he is to accept the risks of producing, he must also have his incentive. The incentive of the risk bearer is referred to as profit, and it is only when there is a chance of getting profit that an entrepreneur enters freely into a productive enterprise. Presumably, the greater the risk he foresees, the greater the profit he will expect; or he will enter into other less hazardous undertakings. Although there is some assurance that the owners of land and capital and the worker will receive their returns, there is usually no assurance that the risk bearer will get a profit. That is a part of the risk he assumes. The enterpreneur also assumes the liabilities of the enterprise to some extent, so that it is possible not only that he will get no profit, but that he will actually have to repay losses of operation.

Other Expenses of Production. The expenses of production then include the appropriate returns for the factors of production—rent for land, interest for capital, and wages for labor—and in addition, profit for the risk bearer. In a free enterprise system there could be no production without these expenses. Other inescapable expenses enter, as well. Every private productive enterprise must pay taxes, whether or not it operates successfully. Equipment deteriorates and becomes obsolete and must in time be replaced, so that funds must be set aside for depreciation. There are noneconomic risks that must be guarded against—fire, tornadoes, hail, etc., and for these there must be some insurance. There must be, in most cases, advertising and promotional activities other than those included in the wages of salesmen. All of these expenses must be met before there can be a profit from the enterprise.

Theories of Wages

Returning to wages, which are basic to labor problems, economic theorists have from time to time tried to find a formula for determining how much of the return from productive enterprise should go for wages. Because such theories have important bearing upon the thinking of those who set wages, they require a brief treatment.

The Iron Law. One of the earliest of these theories was that of the English economist Ricardo, which has been called the "iron law" of wages. It is the theory that the worker should be paid just enough to supply him and his family with the bare necessities to keep them alive and functioning with some degree of efficiency. The reasoning was that if labor were paid more than this bare subsistence wage there would be a tendency for each worker to have more children who in turn would come

into the labor market and create such a surplus of labor that wages would be forced down even below the subsistence level. In terms of supply and demand, it was the notion that wages above subsistence level would increase supply beyond demand, and thus bring about even lower prices for labor.

Such a theory, of course, has had little popularity with workers and did not long hold open support among the employers of labor. It runs counter to the general population principle that rising living standards are accompanied by lower birth rates rather than higher ones, and that a well paid working force would produce fewer children and future workers than would a working force living at or near subsistence level.

The Wages Fund Theory. A later theory, and one that still influences much thinking about wages, is called the wages fund theory. It is the notion that there is a relatively fixed return from productive enterprises to be divided among the factors of production and the risk bearer. If wages are high, that means low returns for land, capital, and risk bearing. There are always marginal owners of land and capital, and marginal risk bearers, meaning those who are attracted by a given rate of return, but would not be attracted into productive enterprise at even a slightly lower return. Thus, any increase in wages by reducing, however little, the returns of other factors and risk bearers drives the marginal units from the productive enterprise, with the result that there is less enterprise, meaning fewer jobs and a lesser total wage for labor.

According to this theory, then, low wages are, in the long run, beneficial to labor because they mean more productive enterprise, more jobs, and a greater total return to labor. Conversely, this theory holds that high wages are, in the long run, disastrous to labor because they cause unemployment and a slowdown of production.

The Marginal Productivity Theory. More realistic, and currently the prevailing theory of economists, is the marginal productivity theory. This theory holds that wages are determined by the increase in production that can be attributed to the last unit of labor added to a given quantity of land and capital. If the wages are higher than that which this last unit produces, it is unprofitable for the employer to add it, and he presumably will not. If wages are less than that which the last unit of labor adds, then the employer can profitably add still another unit of labor, and he presumably will.

This theory is quite logical in considering a single productive enterprise, but when the entire economy is taken into account it requires some modification; and there are economists who, while holding to the main line of reasoning, do offer a somewhat different version of the marginal

productivity theory. They hold that in the whole economy employers can often afford to take an occasional reduction in profits by paying workers more than the increment of the last unit of labor added, simply because, in so doing, they increase the purchasing power of the workers and therefore improve the market for their goods. With the improved market more efficient production is possible and the marginal increment then can build up to the point where it justifies the somewhat higher wages.

This emphasis upon purchasing power has become the principal theoretical argument of those economists who support high wages. It represents the opposite extreme from the "iron law" of wages which was first discussed. It reflects the sweeping changes that have been coming about in productive enterprise and in thinking about wages since the early stages of the Industrial Revolution.

It may be noted from this brief sketch of wage theories that almost any wage policy of workers or employers can be supported logically, depending upon assumptions and points of view of the theorists. When arguments arise over wage policies, these various ideas, in one form or another, find expression and become a part of the controversy.

Other Considerations

The theories of wages help explain much of the thought that enters into wage controversies, but they omit some of the very real considerations that must be noted to understand the wages paid to given workers at given times and in particular enterprises. One circumstance to be considered in connection with the marginal productivity theory is relative ignorance on the part of employers as to just what the increment to production due to the last unit of labor is. Another is that few employers are entirely cold blooded in their calculations. Affecting both employer and worker are customs and traditions which take form in prevailing wage rates, often having no direct relation to the increment of a given worker or group of workers. Finally, there are individual and collective bargaining of workers with employers. The last two considerations are of most significance at this point.

Individual Bargaining. Although the term "labor" suggests organized labor, it is well to keep in mind that in our economy the great majority of workers are not organized. Members of all bargaining organizations of workers make up less than a third of the whole labor force, if we include, as we should, white collar workers and "brain" workers in that force. Most workers are dependent upon their own individual bargaining to fix their wages within the limits set by tradition for their particular type of work.

Except in rare times of acute worker shortages, the individual worker is in a relatively weak position to bargain with employers. Most workers have limited resources for the support of themselves and their dependents and therefore cannot actually withhold their labor from the productive enterprise, nor take the risks involved in seeking new employment.

Unlike land, a person's value as a worker does not increase with time when the person is idle. The reverse result is more likely to come from idleness; and increase in value is most likely to come from constant and continuous employment. Nor does labor possess the fluidity of capital. The worker is seldom in a position to move from place to place and from occupation to occupation freely. Thus in the bargaining process the worker is least able to wait through protracted periods for a favorable settlement. He and his family must have food, clothing, and shelter, day after day, and if they have savings they are loathe to use them. Rarely does the individual worker have at his command any considerable knowledge of the labor market and other conditions which might enter into wage bargaining, nor is he usually experienced or skilled in the art of bargaining itself.

The individual worker, dependent entirely upon his own resources in the bargaining process, usually must accept the conditions and wages which the employer chooses to offer. Thus the necessity for organization of workers to increase their strength for collective bargaining has arisen, and such bargaining plays a determining role in fixing wage scales for a large proportion of workers.

Collective Bargaining. Workers effectively organized for collective bargaining have many advantages which the individual worker lacks. They may collectively accumulate reserve funds to tide individual workers over a period of waiting. They may select from their numbers those most skilled in the bargaining arts. They may keep better informed of labor markets and conditions affecting them. They may employ experts, such as lawyers, to advise them. They may, if they constitute a sufficient proportion of particular types of labor, bring pressure upon employers. They may develop, through time and experience, policies and strategies. As consumers, they may threaten and carry out boycotts. It is also possible for them to threaten, or employ, violence in efforts to gain their objectives. If their organizations are large enough and strong enough, they may bring political influence to bear in disputes.

In the act of bargaining itself, an individual or committee which represents a labor union meets with the employer or his representatives. The bargaining is usually concerned mainly with wage scales for members of the union, but there are also other points over which bargaining

occurs. Among these are the length of the working day and week, whether employers shall operate "closed" or "open" shops, the conditions under which workers may be discharged or employed, and many other matters of concern to both sides in the bargaining. If the bargaining is successful in bringing about agreement, it culminates usually in a written contract between the union and the employer. Each side in the bargaining is intent upon advancing its own interests, although both employers and unions often differ as to what those interests are.

The Labor Movement

Collective bargaining is the central purpose behind the organized labor movement, but other functions have, from time to time, played an important part in the movement. It had its beginnings early in the Industrial Revolution and has had a long history of growth and development. The movement has taken somewhat different directions in different countries.

The American Labor Movement.[1] Early in American history the labor movement was limited in scope and was relatively ineffective. Among its early concerns was opposition to the importation and employment of immigrant workers, as well as benefit to the few American workers who belonged to the scattered unions. Following the Civil War the movement had a rapid growth and aimed at broad objectives in the field of social reform. Efforts were made to unite laborers with farmers in organizations to bring political pressure to bear for the adoption of reform legislation.

The unions of the post-Civil War period achieved little real success and were divided into many factions. Eventually these early organizations began to decline, and in their place there developed what for a long time was to be the American pattern of organized labor strategy. Under leadership of Samuel Gompers, the American Federation of Labor took shape. In this phase of the movement organized labor adopted as its over-all policy acceptance of the capitalistic free enterprise system and attempted to find ways of working for the benefit of union members within the system. It shunned partisan politics or other affiliations that might hamper its freedom of action. It permitted local autonomy to unions and bound them only in a loose federation whose function it was to lend aid to local unions in time of need. The prevailing type of union was the craft union, that is, the organization of workers engaged in identical work regardless of employers for whom they worked. They were,

[1] Robert F. Hoxie, *Trade Unionism in the United States,* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1921.

for the most part, unions of skilled workers, and they attempted to keep the supply of skilled workers controlled. Their general strategy was to work toward limited and achievable goals, principal among which were constantly increased wage rates, shorter working days and weeks, and the "closed" shop, or agreements with employers which bound the employers to hire only members of the craft union for particular kinds of work.

The weapons of organized labor in this phase of the movement were principally the strike and the boycott. The strike was a work stoppage by the members of a union if they could not come to a satisfactory agreement with an employer. Members of other unions might engage in a sympathy strike against the same employer. Boycotts were effected largely through the use of the union label on goods or the display of union cards in places where services were sold. In case of a boycott the card or use of the label was withdrawn, and union members, their friends, and sympathizers simply stopped buying the particular goods or services of the employer with whom the union was in dispute.

The employer had as his principal tactics the use of court injunctions and of strike breakers, although he might also close his enterprise and "lock out" the workers, or "blacklist" individual workers who engaged in strikes or other practices he considered detrimental to his interests. The use of the injunction tended to bring the government, through the court, into the dispute. The use of strike breakers frequently led to disorders and violence. This, in turn, might bring intervention of police, militia, or other governmental agencies.

When labor disputes became prolonged, the deciding factor was usually public opinion, with the result that a large part of the efforts of both parties to the dispute was an appeal for public sympathy. If the public were sympathetic to the workers the employer usually had to comply with the workers' demands. If they were, on the other hand, on the side of the employer, the workers often were forced to give in; or the strike was "broken" and the employer continued his enterprise with new workers. Both sides resorted to the press and other avenues of appeal to the public. Usually such avenues were more accessible to the employer than to the unions, but in centers where labor was sufficiently strong the unions established their own publications or used handbills and pamphlets.

Industrial Unions. In recent years the American labor movement has taken on a somewhat different form. This has been evidenced by the rise of industrial unions to take their place in importance beside the craft unions. The industrial union includes workers of many crafts, but employed in the same industry. This change has been in part a result

of the increasing concentration of business enterprise in large corporations and super-corporations, and the strengthening of employer organizations throughout industries. The larger and stronger employer organizations made necessary larger and stronger labor organizations, so patterned as to parallel more closely the changing structure of productive enterprise.

The industrial unions are not limited to skilled workers and are less exclusive than were the older craft unions. They place more reliance in numbers and in the accumulation of large reserve funds or "war chests." They also have tended to make themselves felt more in the partisan politics of states and the nation. The present labor movement of the United States includes both the older type of organization and the newer. The American Federation of Labor, although having changed, is still mainly a federation of local craft unions. The Congress of Industrial Organizations is made up principally of the industrial unions. The rival organizations are nearly equal in size, and there has been keen competition between the two, both for membership and for the recognition as bargaining agents for workers in particular enterprises and industries—a competition which has frequently brought sharp conflict and even violence between members of the different organizations.

There have been many developments in the American labor movement outside the dominating organizations. From time to time other national labor organizations have gained temporary prominence and influence, as was true of the Industrial Workers of the World during the early part of the century. Independent labor organizations have also developed in some industries and crafts, the outstanding examples being the Big Four brotherhoods of railway workers.

The Labor Movement Abroad. The labor movement had earlier beginnings in Europe, and especially in England, than in the United States. In each country it has had a somewhat different development, but in general it might be said that characteristic of European labor organizations has been their close affiliation with partisan politics, and usually with socialism. They have not, as has the labor movement in America, completely accepted free enterprise capitalism, but have sought, usually by slow reform but occasionally by violence and revolution, to displace capitalism with some form of collective ownership of key enterprises.

An important weapon developed by labor organizations in many European countries, but one which has found little favor among workers in this country, is the general strike. The general strike is the more or less complete work stoppage in all key enterprises in a city or a nation to bring political pressure for government intervention or reform. Frequently the general strike results in widespread disorder and violence.

At times it has brought the overthrow of a regime in a nation and its replacement by one more favorable to measures, which organized labor desires.

In a number of European countries, but more especially in France, the labor movement has had in it a strong element of syndicalism, which is opposed to the capitalistic system. Using the notion that capitalism will eventually fall from its own weaknesses, syndicalism aims at hastening that fall through sabotage, and takes expression in property destruction as a weapon to be employed in labor disputes and on all possible occasions.

Another characteristic of the labor movement in European countries that makes it somewhat different from developments in America has been the strong international affiliations and organizations of workers.[2] Often the international labor movement in Europe has been clandestine because of opposition coming from governments; but it has had an important part in both the ideologies and strategy of labor and a great influence upon the internal politics of most European nations.

The labor movements in Latin American countries have more closely resembled European patterns than those of the United States. They have maintained close political affiliations and have often been "revolutionary" as they have used the term, that is, committed to long-range programs of governmental and political reform. The movements in Latin America had a later start than the movement in the United States; and as yet the labor organizations are comparatively small and weak, largely because of the lesser degree of industrialization in the other American Republics.

The Public Interest

The principals to any given labor dispute are the employer and the workers involved, a relatively small group, but such disputes often affect the interests and welfare of much larger groups, or publics. If the workers succeed in getting what they demand, there is cost involved for the employer which may be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, although this is not always a necessary consequence. If the employer succeeds in breaking a strike, this may indirectly effect many people of a community because of the loss of buying power on the part of the defeated workers; it may bring a lower wage scale which will affect other wage scales adversely. More significantly, if the dispute results in a prolonged work stoppage, it may reduce production of some commodity or service to the inconvenience of many people and may lead to a slowing up of all business activity in the area affected.

[2] The "international" unions of the United States are closely affiliated with similar unions in Canada, but have shunned effective organizational relationships with labor in other countries.

The range of effects of labor disputes depends, of course, on a number of variables. In larger industries, such as the steel companies, a prolonged work stoppage will have nation-wide and even international effects, because the products of these industries enter into so many other kinds of production. A widespread work stoppage in coal mines soon affects railways as well as many kinds of factories and power plants. Even a work stoppage involving comparatively few workers may cause a great deal of industrial idleness if these workers are engaged in some operation that is vital to the operation of many larger productive enterprises, as in some highly skilled processes such as the production of dies for precision tools.

There are other variables which determine, in part, the general effects of work stoppages. In time of overproduction, the temporary cessation of some kinds of enterprise may serve to relieve the market of surpluses; whereas in times of underproduction any loss of productive time may be serious for the whole economy. There are seasonal variations for some industries. A work stoppage which affects fuel supplies is more serious in the fall or winter than in the spring or summer. A stoppage in an automobile factory may be more serious at the particular season when new models are being produced.

These and other variables are well known to the strategists on both sides of possible labor disputes and become the basis for timing of their various tactical moves. In them may be seen the efforts to arouse the public through affecting its interests vitally. Just how publics will react to serious threats to their vital interests is not entirely predictable, and the best planned strategies may work against those who initiate the dispute.

Weakness of Publics. Although the publics affected by a strike may number many times as many people as those who are directly involved in the dispute, and although the reactions of those publics may ultimately decide the issue, the publics themselves are greatly handicapped in protecting their interests. They are seldom united, at least in early stages of such disputes, and they are poorly informed even as to the ways in which the disputes affect them. They are apt to be confronted with conflicting claims as to the nature of the dispute and its relation to their welfare. If they are relatively agreed upon the merits in the controversy, they are poorly organized to intervene in their own behalf, and only indirectly can they make their feelings felt with sufficient force to bring a resumption of production.

The governmental units—local, state, or Federal—are presumably the guardians of public interest and often have intervened in labor disputes to protect those interests as they saw them. In the case of public employees, whose function it is to guard the safety of the public, government

intervention is usually prompt, as it is in the case of major railway disputes which threaten to shut down the arteries of transportation even for a brief period, so vital is transportation to the welfare of whole communities and the entire productive plant of the nation.

Direct public action may take the form of a boycott of certain products if the public is sympathetic with labor, but such boycotts are apt to be ineffective except in the case of retail stores. More usually public reaction is delayed until there is an election when it may be reflected by voters at the polls. In national elections where labor relations have entered as issues there have been swings from pro-employer to pro-labor, and back to pro-employer sentiment, followed by legislation designed to reflect these changes in sentiment. By general interpretation, public opinion in the country was mainly pro-labor during the 1930's but by the mid-1940's had swung back to pro-employer attitudes. National legislation, as well as much state legislation, reflected these changes.

The Role of Government

As in the case of other phases of economic activity, the role of government in labor disputes is controversial. Under the *laissez-faire* doctrine, government would play no part except that of protecting property, lives, and maintaining order. Just as ideas about the place of government in relation to business enterprise has swung from the extreme *laissez-faire* position, more and more general opinion has been that the government may and should have a more positive role in labor disputes. Quite generally it is thought that government should intervene actively where the public interest is affected or threatened. This intervention may go so far as for the government to seize temporarily industries that are stopped by labor disputes, as has been done in connection with the railroads and the coal mines. There has been a considerable recent increase in this country in the number and range of laws which govern, to some extent, matters such as minimum wages and working conditions that had previously been matters for collective bargaining. Numerous laws have been enacted to limit the kinds of tactics that may be employed in labor disputes; and governmental commissions and boards have been set up to act as conciliators or arbitrators of such disputes.

Fact Finding, Conciliation, Arbitration. In its position as referee in labor disputes government employs one or more of three general devices. The first is investigation or fact finding, an important function since practically all the information which reaches the public concerning such disputes is partisan and biased. Fact-finding commissions study the claims of the disputing parties and, having arrived at a set of findings regarding

these claims, make them available to responsible public authorities who may, in turn, place them before the public. Thus the powerful influence of public opinion may be used to bring about a speedy settlement.

Conciliation is the most usual device of governmental agencies. They simply undertake to bring the two parties of a dispute together under circumstances as favorable as possible to a settlement of issues, perhaps offering possible compromises and solutions. The disputing parties need not follow the advice of conciliators, nor reach a settlement; but, when such efforts are the center of publicity, especially if the work stoppage or threat of work stoppage is of serious public concern, public opinion is apt to turn against the party which seems to be obstructing an agreement, a position in which neither side, as a rule, wants to be found.

Arbitration is much like a court procedure. The parties to the dispute agree in advance, or are bound by law, to accept the findings and decisions of the arbitrators. The arbitrators then hold hearings of both sides of the case and make binding decisions on the issues. This is the surest and most dependable way of bringing about quick settlement, but it has the disadvantage that it may leave a feeling of bitterness on one or both sides of the controversy. Such feelings may more than undo the gains made by the actual settlement of the dispute.

Other Devices. It is commonplace now for governments to require "cooling off" periods between the time when a strike is decided upon and the time when it may legally begin. Such periods permit more time for reaching friendly settlements and tend to dispel the emotional tensions which are generated in labor disputes and prevent reasonable negotiations and settlements.

When labor disputes bring violence or threats of violence, government must, of course, intervene with police or armed forces to preserve order and protect lives and property. Such intervention may frequently become, in effect, the use of force to break a strike and thus work on the side of the employer. When it is employer's property which is endangered and nonstriking workers or guardians of employers' properties who are threatened with physical harm, the alignment of police and other government forces on the side of the employer is largely predetermined by the very circumstances of labor disputes.

Since many individual and collective rights are jeopardized by labor disputes, the function of courts as governmental agencies that serve as a refuge for those whose rights are invaded or threatened represents an important phase of the government's role in labor disputes. It is true that workers have access to the courts as well as employers have; but in many cases the access is not equal and, as in the case of police and

armed forces, the intervention of courts in labor disputes has most frequently been on the side of employers.

The Unorganized Workers

As has been noted previously, the great majority of wage workers in our economy are not organized for collective bargaining purposes, if we use wage in its broad economic sense to include salaries and other forms of remuneration for work. Such workers depend, for the most part, on individual bargaining, and upon the general traditions which govern particular types of work, for the determination of their wages and working conditions. Most such workers are in the "white-collar class" and are employed in various kinds of personal services, trade, and clerical work. Such workers tend to identify themselves with the employer class, and their hopes are built upon becoming members of that class. What protection they have in their isolated positions comes largely from the usages which have grown up in many lines of employment, which give some assurance of tenure and advancement for faithful service.

Another group of unorganized workers, not so numerous, are manual workers, whose position is the most precarious of any in our economy. Mainly unskilled, they are often casual, drifting workers who move from place to place following the changing demand for labor. Usually they have no assurance of tenure, receive the lowest wage scales, and are the first to be discharged and the last to be employed in the fluctuations of the labor market. Most notable among this group are the migratory farm workers, many of whom are of foreign extraction, but there are other considerable groups, especially among Negroes and "poor whites" of the southeastern states.

Sporadic efforts have been made to organize such workers into effective bargaining groups. Such efforts have been closely associated with "radical" movements and have been complicated by social reform objectives. Because of the transient nature of the workers involved, their low status in their communities, and their impoverishment, they have presented great obstacles to effective organizations.

Summary

Labor is one of several factors involved in the productive process and, as such, shares in the division of the returns. However, since there is no universally accepted formula for the sharing of those returns, it must compete in some form of bargaining process. A number of theories have been advanced to indicate what the share of labor should be, ranging from the "iron law" which would allow to workers just enough to support themselves and their families at the subsistence level, to those who

claim that labor should have all of the return. The general trend has been away from the subsistence wage idea to theories which would justify high wages, based upon labor's productivity.

Actually, the individual laborer is at a great disadvantage in bargaining with his employer, in most cases. This is mainly because his resources are limited, and he cannot wait out prolonged disagreements. Nor can he always shift readily from place to place or from job to job. This has led to the growth of labor organizations which engage in collective bargaining with employers. Groups of workers have much more strength than individual workers in pressing their claims against employers.

The labor movement had a late start, relatively, in the United States and, as in other countries, has had its peculiar characteristics. Principal among them has been the tacit acceptance of the capitalistic system. The American Federation of Labor, as representing the first largely successful labor movement in the country, was a loose federation of autonomous local craft unions, with a general policy of seeking limited and achievable goals rather than involved idealistic reforms, and of shunning affiliations with partisan politics. Recently the Congress of Industrial Organizations has come to represent a somewhat different trend in American labor—that toward organization by industries rather than by crafts, with strong central control, and seeking large numbers. This movement has also brought labor more into politics.

A persisting problem in connection with labor is that of the role of government in labor disputes. Here, again, there has been a long-range trend, from the *laissez-faire* position that government had no proper place in them except as a protector of life and property and maintainer of order, to the notion that government has many parts to play and should intervene in labor disputes, especially when public interest is vitally concerned.

Terms

Factors of production
Land
Labor
Rent
Interest
Wages
Entrepreneur
Craft union
Industrial union
Marginal productivity
Collective bargaining
General strike
Syndicalism

Questions

1. What are the appropriate inducements to bring the various factors of production into enterprises?
2. Why is collective bargaining more effective than individual bargaining from labor's viewpoint?

3. In what ways may governmental agencies enter into labor disputes?
4. How has the labor movement in the United States been distinctive?
5. What recent changes have taken place in the American labor movement?
6. Describe the position of unorganized labor in our economy, with reference to (a) "white collar" workers; (b) other workers.

READING LIST

William B. Benton, "The Economics of a Free Society," *Fortune,* Vol. XXX (October, 1944), p. 163.

W. H. Crooks, *The General Strike.* University of North Carolina Press, 1931.

J. I. Griffin, *Strikes: A Study in Quantitative Economics.* Columbia University Press, 1939.

E. T. Hiller, *The Strike: A Study in Collective Action.* University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Robert F. Hoxie, *Trade Unionism in the United States.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1921.

W. E. Moore, *Industrial Relations and the Social Order.* The Macmillan Co., 1946.

Selig Perlman and Philip Taft, *History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1932.* The Macmillan Co., 1935.

S. H. Patterson, *Labor Problems and Causes of Industrial Unrest.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1943.

H. Sikes, *Comparative Economic Systems.* Henry Holt & Co., 1940.

Norman J. Ware, "Trade Unionism in the United States and Canada," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* XV, p. 4. The Macmillan Co., 1935.

CHAPTER XV

Public Finance

All governments, whether national, local, or intermediate, are like huge business enterprises which render economic services and goods to people, collect money, and make expenditures. They are employers of workers; they are consumers; and they occupy other positions in the economic scheme. Their business activities are usually referred to as public finance, in which there are numerous complex problems growing, as do other social problems, from changing conditions on the one hand, and the need for predictability on the other.

Although usually considered somewhat independently, public finance is an integral part of the financial and business structure of the general economy. As previously noted, even under systems in which governmental interference in economic affairs is limited, the very size of governmental economic interests and transactions gives it an inevitably dominant role in the whole economic scheme. Although government is looked upon as a nonprofit organization, having as its purpose to render services at a minimum of cost, we shall note that there are elements of governmental finances which resemble profit as it is recognized in private finance.

Governments are distinguished from private enterprise in that governments have the all-important power of taxation, may enact laws which give them special economic advantages, and usually have considerably more credit than does private business. Governments may be spoken of as "bankrupt" or insolvent, but technically they cannot be so adjudged as can private firms.

Levels of Government Finance. Some of the complexity involved in public finance may be seen when one considers the numerous levels and units of government in this country, all with their own financial operations. The national government is the highest level where the greatest sums are involved. Next in order are the various state governments, and within states are county and municipal governments. Within or cutting across these local levels are numerous special districts organized for particular purposes and involving their own public finance, such as school districts,

judicial districts, reclamation and flood control districts, and others.[1] The number of these various units, depending upon the bases of classification and definition, runs high in the tens of thousands in the United States. The sums which they collect and spend run into scores of billions of dollars a year.

Governmental Budgets

A key consideration in the study of public finances is the governmental budget; and for each separate financial unit there is a separate budget. The budget is, in its essence, a statement of expected income and proposed expenditures for a given period of time, in most cases a fiscal year of twelve calendar months. The budget is quite similar to that of most business enterprises, except for one important consideration. In general procedure, the business enterprise must first show its expected revenues or income and then plan its expenditures to remain within the income. Governmental units more usually first show their necessary or expected expenditures and then the sources from which the money will be raised. This general difference is possible because of government taxing powers. The government gives services and goods for its money, as do private enterprises, but whether people want the goods and services or not, government can require them to make their payments.

It is also significant to note that, in private enterprise, if revenues do not balance expenditures over a considerable period of time the enterprise becomes insolvent and must discontinue operation, or, in the case of corporations, reorganize in such a way as to reduce its outstanding obligations. Governmental units may operate with a deficiency of revenues seemingly indefinitely, as long as there is sufficient general confidence in the government, because presumably the financial soundness of government is supported, ultimately, by the entire wealth over which it has jurisdiction.

Although governments do not technically become bankrupt and are in less immediate need of keeping budgets in balance, nevertheless the effects of unsound governmental financing are so far-reaching for both economic and political organization, and therefore the general welfare of the people, that public finance is always of widespread concern. Historically, both our own national and lesser governments, and the governments of other countries, have provided numerous examples of disastrous results of the loss of confidence of people in government finances. The immediate effect of such loss of confidence is the decline of the government's credit at home and abroad; and, since most governments

[1] Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, "Federal, State, and Local Fiscal Relations," Senate Document No. 69, 1943.

must at some time borrow considerable sums of money, loss of credit in itself is a serious matter. Loss of governmental credit may be reflected in general panic in the business structure of a country and of other countries and have grave political repercussions as well. An important part of every government's authority over its subject peoples, and its prestige in international relations, is bound up with its financial soundness.

Governmental Revenues

The income of governments comes principally from taxes of various kinds levied upon people subject to the government and upon business organizations. But many governments also have large revenues from other than tax sources, which would include public enterprises, tribute levied upon conquered peoples, gifts, and rarely outright seizure of private property. Among sources of non-tax revenues are manipulation of the value of money and borrowing.

Taxes. Taxes may be variously classified as direct and indirect, progressive and regressive, "hidden" or open, or more specifically according to certain detailed characteristics, as will be noted later.

Whether a tax is direct or indirect depends upon whether the point at which it is levied corresponds with the incidence, or the point at which it is ultimately paid. A direct tax presumably is levied upon the person or business organization which is expected to actually bear the burden. Thus a poll or head tax, levied upon every adult person, would be a burden upon the same person on whom it is levied. On the other hand, some taxes are levied upon one person or business with the expectation that it will be passed on to another person or business who will bear the actual burden. An excise tax on a package of cigarettes may be levied upon and paid by the manufacturer of the cigarettes but with the full expectation that it will be passed on to the consumer of cigarettes, upon whom the burden of the tax actually falls.

A progressive tax is one which is levied according to the presumed ability of the taxpayer to pay, so that persons or organizations with larger wealth and income pay not only a larger tax, but a larger percentage of their wealth or income in taxes. Persons of less wealth and income pay a smaller percentage of what they have, and, sometimes, no tax at all. On the other hand, a regressive tax is one which falls disproportionately upon those least able to pay, and lightly upon those with greatest ability to pay. A tax on a necessity is usually a regressive tax because the poor must pay a larger part of their income for the goods, whereas wealthier persons, using little if any more of the goods, pay a much smaller part of their income for it.

Hidden taxes are usually indirect taxes which are so levied that the persons upon whom their final incidence falls do not have clear knowledge that they are paying the tax, or how much. Probably few people who use cigarettes have any clear notion of the part of the purchase price that goes to various governmental units for taxes. By contrast, open taxes are those which are clearly announced as such to the persons who must pay them, so that they leave no doubt as to the fact that taxes are being paid, nor of the precise amount. The general property tax is usually of this nature.

General Property Taxes. Historically, many governmental units in this country have relied chiefly upon the general property tax for revenues. The tax is a rate levied upon the assessed valuation of the property owned by an individual or organization, and usually is on both personal and real property. In practice, however, it becomes mainly a tax upon real estate. It is an open tax, and a direct tax upon the owner. It has in it elements of both progressive and regressive taxation. Since the ownership of property is one indication of ability to pay, it is to that extent progressive; but since it is usually at a flat rate on all similar classes of property, its burden is heaviest, often, on the small property owner with the least ability to pay. The fact that much property is intangible, as that represented by shares of stock or bank deposits, and can easily be concealed, many persons escape heavy property taxes even though possessing considerable wealth; whereas the owner of real estate, unable to conceal his land and buildings, must pay a relatively heavy tax.

One of the persistent criticisms of the tax on real estate is that it tends to penalize improvements on land. If a person holds unimproved land which contributes nothing to the wealth of the community or its appearance, his tax is low because the assessment is low. If he improves the land, puts it to productive use or beautifies it, the assessed valuation may rise and thus his tax becomes greater. Critics of the tax argue that this tends to keep much land out of useful production and prevents other improvements.

Advantages of the property tax are that real estate, at least, is obvious and tax claims against it are readily enforceable; that such taxation is relatively easy and cheap to collect; that the tax is well understood and carries the prestige of long usage.

The general property tax is still the main tax source for many local governmental units and special districts and is an important basis of taxation for most state governments in this country.

Income Taxes. The chief reliance for our national government, and increasingly important as a source of state revenues, is personal and corporate income taxes. The income tax can be classed as direct and open and is generally considered the most progressive of taxes. It is levied against higher incomes, and the very lowest are usually exempt. It includes a flat rate on incomes above the taxable level, and a surtax, or added tax, on a graduated scale on higher incomes, so that the more the income the higher the percentage of it that goes for income taxes.

Since the taxpayer must make his own report on the size of his income under oath, deliberate evasion involves perjury which often can be detected rather easily. Thus it becomes dangerous to attempt to conceal income, although in practice there is widespread effort through means which presumably lie within the law to evade the full burden of income tax.

Quite often income taxes involve double taxation for some persons, especially for shareholders of profitable corporations, since the corporation must pay taxes on its income before giving dividends to stockholders, and the stockholder must, in turn, pay income tax on his dividend. Then, too, both states and the Federal government may tax the same incomes, and in some cases other governmental units levy taxes on them.

Sales and Excise Taxes. A large part of state revenues and a considerable portion of tax receipts at other levels come from sales and excise taxes. The latter, excise taxes, are imposed principally at the Federal level and are taxes on goods and services before they reach the consumer, so that often they are, in effect, hidden taxes. The sales tax is levied upon the consumer at the time he makes his purchase, and thus is much more easily recognized.

The excise tax, as prevoiusly explained, is indirect, whereas the sales tax is direct. Both types of tax are mainly regressive, in that they tend to fall the more heavily upon the lower income groups. A special type of sales tax is the luxury tax, which in specific instances may be progressive since it may place a high rate on very expensive goods which only the wealthy may buy. The greater volume of luxury taxes, however, is on such things as theater tickets and long-distance telephone calls and may be mainly regressive, since persons of little means may find them much more of a burden than those of large means.

Other Kinds of Taxes. The ingenuity of many persons through many centuries has gone into the devising of different kinds of taxes. There are gift and inheritance taxes, customs duties, tariffs, nuisance taxes, poll and head taxes, automobile and other licenses, excess profits taxes, and fees which are, in effect, taxes, to pay for special governmental services.

A part of every dollar that is earned or spent goes into taxes, the proportion varying from place to place and time to time. So complex is the tax system that it is almost impossible for any person to know exactly how much he pays in taxes.

Policy Taxes. Most taxes are assessed primarily to get revenue for government, but many are levied principally for other purposes. In the history of the United States the tariff has been used principally for the protection of industries rather than for the money it brings in. Nuisance taxes are used mainly to abate unhealthy or undesirable conditions or practices. Heavy licenses are sometimes used to limit certain kinds of businesses.[2] Even the income tax, which is primarily for revenue, may be used as a control on inflation or as a means of checking types of crime.

The use of taxes for other than revenue purposes is controverted, and many tax experts claim that it is unwise; nevertheless, it is such an obvious means, ready-at-hand, which governments may use to enforce policies that its use has become commonplace and is generally accepted.

Limits of Taxation. There is no certain answer to the question of how much taxes governments may levy. Theoretically governments may carry taxation to the point of outright confiscation, and in some cases this has been done in connection with the property of particular groups. Taxes are subject to the law of diminishing returns; that is, if tax rates pass a certain point, the income from them will be less rather than more than from a slightly higher rate.

In the long run the application of this principal of diminishing returns relates to the effect of tax rates on general prosperity. It is axiomatic that a prosperous people and economy can pay more taxes than impoverished people and a sluggish economy. It would follow that if taxes are so high as to destroy the general prosperity there would soon be less to collect in the form of taxes. Such a guide to taxation is extremely difficult to apply, since it is always debatable in a complex economy such as ours whether taxes are too high. They never work alone in determining the state of the economy.

In the shorter run, high tax rates lead to increases in evasions which may go so far as to lower the return of the tax; or to outright refusal to pay taxes as occurred in many parts of the rural United States in the early 1920's and in the 1930's.

Tax Exemptions. It has always been the policy of our own and other

[2] An example of taxation to discourage a business practice is described in R. G. and C. Gladys Blakey, "Chain Store Taxation," *Taxes*, Vol. XIX, 1941.

governments to provide some tax exemptions, especially in connection with general property and income taxes. Heads of families usually are permitted partial exemptions according to the number of dependents they support. It is accepted practice for war veterans to be permitted partial tax exemption; and church organizations, nonprofit educational and charitable institutions, and others may be entirely exempt.

Tax exemptions are always matters of government policy not strictly financial in nature, and may be used to encourage marriage, child bearing, certain kinds of economic activities, education, etc. Especially where exemptions are used to support economic enterprises, as in the case of cooperatives, they are matters of considerable controversy for they tend to give some competitive advantages over others.

Non-Tax Revenues

Borrowing. Nearly all governmental units borrow money for short or long periods. A large part of the theoretical debt of each individual in this country is represented by his share of debts owed by the various governmental units under which he lives. It has previously been noted that the borrowing possibilities of governments are more flexible than those of private enterprises, so that the temptation is great to use this method of obtaining governmental revenues without resort immediately to the painful and politically inexpedient device of raising tax rates.

In time of war or other national emergency, especially, governments may find borrowing the only practicable means of quickly raising huge sums needed for vastly expanded programs of expenditures. Raising armies of millions of men, paying the individuals who make them up, providing for their dependents, giving them expensive equipment and training, constructing huge modern battleships and air armadas cost tremendous sums of money, and cannot wait upon slow processes of levying and assessing taxes. The aftermath of war brings its new expenses, usually with high price levels, and the need for further borrowing.

The government borrows large sums by selling bonds to individuals, business firms, and banks. These bonds obligate the government to repay at a definite future time the principal sum of the bond, and in the meantime to pay interest for the use of the money. Thus outstanding bonds make it necessary for the government, if it intends to meet its obligation, to set aside a fund from which the principal may eventually be paid and to pay interest beginning at once.

The larger the government debt, the more of its revenue must go into sinking funds and interest payments, so that heavy borrowing at any time means the need for larger receipts thereafter until the debt is finally paid. It is rarely that any governmental unit is entirely free

of debt. The debt of the United States amounts to two hundred fifty billion dollars, and the combined debts of the many lesser governmental units of the country run into scores of billions.

Governmental borrowing, like taxation, may be used for other purposes than raising money. Governments may use borrowing to control the amount of money in circulation and to influence interest rates. Most government debts arise, however, because governmental units find it impossible, at a given time, to raise needed funds by taxation, or is reluctant to do so.

Manipulation of Currency. Modern governments, having a monopoly on the coinage of money, have always at hand a source of revenue in their powers to manipulate currency, especially since the disappearance a generation ago of the open market for gold. It is within the sovereign power of each nation to state the value of its own money, and if the nation is in an economically secure position, such declarations must be respected. Every nation, to some extent, manipulates the value of its currency to bring revenue into the treasury. Probably one of the greatest of such manipulations was that of the American government when it changed the gold content of the dollar in 1936, with a resulting "profit" of several hundred millions of dollars for the treasury. Such expedients are short-lived, and probably cost more, in the long run, than they bring in, but in times of emergency may be unavoidable.

Revenues from Land. Some nations and states derive revenue from the sale or rental of publicly owned lands to individuals or corporations. The United States, at the beginning of our national history, was desperately poor in other resources, but rich in seemingly unbounded stretches of fertile land. The main income for the national government was, at times, derived from such lands. This source of income has declined progressively in relative importance, but even today the Federal government has large land holdings, especially in the western states, which bring a steady return from rentals, fees, and other charges made for individual use and exploitation of them.

Government Enterprise. Increasingly, at the Federal level, income from government enterprises is an important item in the governmental budget. But at the local level, this item may be among the most important in the entire budget. Especially is this true of municipalities that own and operate their own public utilities, which, under favorable conditions, may be sources of considerable revenue.

Also in keeping with trends is the governmental income from interest on a wide variety of loans. Governmental units, especially at the national level, have become, in effect, large-scale bankers, making loans of various kinds to individuals, groups, and corporations, and the amount of interest derived from such loans runs into great sums each year. The various governmental agencies which make loans to farmers, those which lend money to home owners and purchasers, those which assist industries and business, and others, all lend money at interest, and in their totality, their interest collections bulk large in the national budget.

Government Expenditures

Although much is said of the expense of government, it is well to consider that the government provides a wide variety of goods, and especially services, which are necessary or convenient, and at less cost than many of them could be had through other channels. In addition it is to be noted that the money which governments raise by taxation and other methods, including borrowing, is usually put into circulation rapidly and becomes the basis for business transactions which in turn mean wages, profits, and other income for individuals and organizations. The government employee who lives off of tax revenues helps to carry the load by paying taxes, and also buys groceries and clothing, builds or rents a home, contributes to church and lodge, and otherwise is a part of the general economy. If a governmental unit builds a road it may employ a contractor who employs workers, buys materials, pays taxes, and otherwise contributes to business activity. In fact, the total expenditures of all governmental units are a very large part of the support of the entire economy, so that actually government becomes a channel through which money is removed from circulation only to be returned to circulation.

Kinds of Expenditures. The types of expenditures vary with time and country, and with levels of government in this country. Most national governments make their largest expenditures on armaments and preparedness for the eventuality of war. Unless a means is found of removing war as a constant threat to the very existence of governments, such expenditures will continue, in all probability, to stand in first place. Such expenditures are usually considered as economically wasteful, since what they purchase soon becomes obsolete and must be replaced. But it is necessary also to note that they stimulate general economic activity as much or more than other types of governmental expenditures, because most of the money goes into employment and the purchase of essential

materials which occupy key places in the general productive enterprise, such as steel.[3]

Other important expenditures of the national government in this country include those for welfare and social security. At the national level, this is a comparatively new type of important expense, but one which grows constantly. Here, again, the expense can only be judged fully in light of the flow of money into the economy through such channels. People at low economic levels who receive governmental help spend their money rapidly, so that it is soon in circulation to create demands for a variety of goods and services.

The service and repayment of government loans is coming to be a large item of Federal expense. Through time this expense assumes greater and greater importance, and it means that the government is becoming increasingly significant as a financial institution, since such activity is not unlike that of a bank. Through sound governmental policy, the great size of public debt expenditures may serve as a stabilizing influence in the economy; unwisely used, such a position can become an increasing threat to the economic welfare of the nation, and, for a nation in the position of the United States, to the economic welfare of the world.

Lower Levels. At the state level, the principal expenditures of public funds are for highways and highway improvement, education, and social service. Highways may be considered as costs which are investments to bring in possible greater returns, whereas education and welfare expenditures bring only remotely indirect returns.

Counties and municipalities spend more for education than for any other purposes. Money so spent goes largely into pay rolls, and next into construction costs, both of which bear direct effects upon the total economy. Next in importance are expenses of police and other public safety services, which represent, again, money that goes primarily into wages. Such money as enters into wages serves as a stimulant to the economy, since most wage earners spend the money they receive quickly.

Throughout is the general principle that the cost of government brings returns not only in vague or concrete services to taxpayers, but also in the stimulation that placing money into circulation through employment, purchase of materials, and other expenditures, brings to the general economy. If it were possible to visualize a situation in which all government would become unnecessary overnight and therefore no taxes need be paid, the effect might well be ruinous to the economy

[3] J. H. Williams, "Deficit Spending," *American Economic Review*, Vol. XXX, 1941; C. O. Hardy, "Fiscal Policy and National Income," *American Economic Review*, Vol. XXXII, 1942.

because of the many channels for distribution of money which would be closed.

Political Uses of Public Funds. Government, as we know it in this country, could not function without partisan political organizations. Yet there is no adequate legitimate provision for the support of such organizations from public funds. It is necessary, if they are to be supported sufficiently to meet their functions, to finance them by other than legally provided means. The most obvious source for such support is public funds raised by taxation, and a large part of the support of partisan political organization comes, indirectly, from taxation, even though no legal provisions exist for such uses of public money.

The chief of the avenues through which tax funds are used to support political organizations, from national to local levels, is patronage. The President of the United States uses public funds to support his political party through his appointive power, just as the ward boss in the least political unit uses public money to pay for jobs for his supporters. At all levels in between patronage is a recognized way in which tax moneys may be used for the necessary purpose of keeping political party organizations functioning.

Other ways of using tax moneys to support partisan political organizations are included in the term "graft." This term has no exact meaning and may cover a large variety of practices from the most flagrant violations of law to the mildest form of "honest" graft. Any advantage given to individuals or firms which enables them to secure more money than they otherwise might, and emanating from official sources, is, in the broadest use of the term, graft.

"Profits" in Public Finance. The use of public funds, raised for the most part by taxation, for partisan political purposes, is the nearest parallel in public finance to "profit" in private enterprise. It is the reward for the political entrepreneurs, or risk takers, and provides an incentive which is closely akin to the "profit motive" for the efforts and sacrifices which go into professional political activities. Although many rationalizations exist to explain the participation of persons, who might otherwise be engaged, in partisan politics, the fact remains that successful partisan activity is a relatively profitable pursuit, even for "reform" politicians.

International Finance

The historical course of international finance has been precarious and variable, but in general it has followed the rule that those nations

which have the power to enforce the financial obligations due them and their subjects or citizens have been the ones which have been able to profit by international dealings. For the national treasury itself international financial dealings have, usually, been without profit and even at a considerable loss. But for the citizens and subjects of such nations the national loss may have meant considerable profits, which, in time, are reflected in the national treasury through taxation.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the British Empire was a drain upon the resources of the national treasury of Great Britain; but at times it meant such profits for individuals and corporations within the Empire that Great Britain thrived and prospered through taxes, thus indirectly more than offsetting the losses shown on the national treasury books.

At the present, much the same holds for the United States, the leading creditor nation of the world.[4] There is no notion that the immense sums spent for European recovery, or aid to Asiatic countries, will be directly repaid, but they are expected to show returns to American business which will bring revenue to the American treasury, directly or indirectly. Otherwise, such aids and loans as are being made to foreign countries and industries within them would be unthinkable and could mean only national bankruptcy.

Summary

Governments are businesses as well as control agencies, and the largest of all financial and business institutions are the national governments of the leading states of the world. Governments are producers, consumers, employers, and bankers on a tremendous scale, having the advantages over all possible competitors of the power to tax, theoretically up to the point of confiscation; and other powers such as those implied in the manipulation of currency, and laws that might fix prices, interest rates, wages, and other economic variables.

The key to government finance is the power to tax, and taxes are various both in incidence and in total effect upon the economy. In connection with incidence, an important distinction is that between progressive taxes which follow the notion of taxation according to ability to pay, and regressive taxes which fall most heavily upon those of least ability. In effects upon the total economy taxing agencies must constantly have in mind that prosperous peoples pay more taxes than relatively impoverished ones, and the amount of taxes levied and collected may be a determining factor.

---

[4] President's Committee on Foreign Aid, "European Recovery and American Aid," Government Printing Office, 1947.

Governments enter into economies not only as tax collectors, but also as producers of goods and services, employers and customers, and spenders. The money that is collected by governments in taxes is returned to the economy through various channels and thus, in itself, becomes an element in the operation of that economy. So large are the operations of governments as business and financial organizations that usually they dominate the whole economy because of such transactions.

Governments engage in financial transactions with other governments, often across national boundaries. In such transactions the nations which are strong enough to protect and enforce their financial interests are in a position to profit from international dealings. Usually such profits are not direct—for the governmental treasury itself may show a loss—but rather indirect as such international transactions create or enhance prosperity for the enterprises from which the government derives its revenues.

Terms

Budget
Revenue
Progressive tax
Regressive tax
Incidence
Excise
Valuation
Duties
Tariff
Fee
Levy
Evasion
Sinking fund
Fiscal

Questions

1. How do governmental budgets differ from those of private enterprises?
2. What are the principal types of taxes?
3. What are some sources of non-tax revenues?
4. For what purposes, other than revenue, may taxes be used?
5. For what principal purposes are governmental revenues spent?
6. In what sense may public finance be said to be "profitable?"

READING LIST

John N. Andrews and Rudolf K. Michels, *Economic Problems of Modern Society*. Ronald Press, 1937.
Roy G. and Gladys Blakey, *The Federal Income Tax*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1940.
A. E. Buck, *Public Budgeting*. Harper & Bros., 1929.
G. Crowther, *Paying for the War*. Clarendon Press, 1940.
H. Dalton, *Principles of Public Finance*. The Macmillan Co., 1937.
D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1931, Eleventh Edition.
Seymour Harris, *Economics of Social Security*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941.
B. V. Ratchford, *American State Debts*. Duke University Press, 1941.
Sidney Ratner, *American Taxation*. W. W. Norton & Co., 1942.
W. J. Schultz, *American Public Finance*. Prentice Hall, 1942, Third Edition.
Frank W. Taussig, *Some Aspects of the Tariff Question*. Harvard University Press, 1931.

CHAPTER XVI

Government and Law

At all stages of human development and among all peoples some form of government is to be found. As would be expected, the government of primitive peoples is relatively simple in organization and is not clearly distinguishable from other institutionalized phases of group life. A few persons, selected by hereditary, ritualistic, or other processes, are endowed with the authority and responsibility of making decisions for the people and settling disputes which arise; whereas others, usually subordinates, are entrusted with seeing that the decisions are carried out.

Among such tribal groups, what order and cohesion there are in the group activities are left largely to the impersonal forces of custom and tradition which are so much a part of the training of children and youths that it seldom occurs to them in maturity either to question or depart from group ways. The occasions for exercise of organized and deliberate controls are relatively rare. When there are infractions of group mores, often the punishment is automatic in that the individual involved inflicts it upon himself, or the kin of the agrieved person revenge the wrong.[1]

What authority is deliberately exercised is as apt to be a matter for religious as for civil authorities, if, indeed, the two are not identical. In the family one member, often the eldest male, has considerable authority over other members of the family, and the tribe or larger group stands ready to reinforce such authority.

The Nature of Social Control

It is obvious that if groups are to survive through time it must be by subordination of individual whims to group needs and goals. If each individual were to follow his own inclinations in every regard, the group could depend upon no one, and all manner of strife might result. The subordination of the individual to group requirements is called social control, something which is never left to chance, but always an integral function of the culture of every group.

[1] B. Malinowski, *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1926.

In all groups, even highly developed civilizations, social control is largely a matter of tradition and custom in which individuals are so thoroughly trained that they become habits of thought and action, seldom questioned, and determining most of the individual's movements. Students who have spent a large part of their lives in school rooms need not know any set of formal rules to behave properly in classroom situations. They usually appear at class on time, take their proper places, go through the motions which are expected of them, all simply because these are a part of their life routine. Such routines, whether in classroom behavior or in other activities, lead the student so to conduct himself that his behavior is compatible with group requirements.

Beyond training in routines, which constitute large parts of the lives of all socially mature individuals, there is also long education in respect for authority and for the dictates which come from those in authority. A little careful observation of the training of children in the home in their early years clearly reveals how much of training is directed to this end, so that a part of their habitual attitudes as they mature are those of conformity to authority.[2]

Limits to Automatic Controls. If we consider controls which really are, in the mature adult, self-control, as being automatic means of bringing individual behavior into line with group requirements, we must note that there are limitations on the extent to which such controls may be relied upon to maintain order and needed cooperation. They can be efficient only insofar as the situations in which they operate can be foreseen. In a society where everyone was efficiently trained in self-control, there would arise at times some situations demanding decisions as to ways of acting in situations that are unprecedented, calling for new rules of behavior and new patterns of authority. If one is thinking of a relatively primitive tribal group living in isolation, except for natural catastrophes, unprecedented situations would be rare and would receive relatively little concern from the group. On the other hand, in rapidly changing societies, as our own and those like it, where change is frequent and wide in its scope, provision for adjustment is a necessary part of the social control mechanism. In such societies the traditional ways can be less relied upon, and greater stress must be placed upon external controls, less automatic in their operation. It is social change which has brought about the high degree of development of governmental organization and techniques to supply such external controls where custom gives no adequate guides. Each meeting of the Congress or other legis-

[2] A. B. Hollingshead, "The Concept of Social Control," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. VI, 1941, pp. 217-224; E. M. Lemert, "The Folkways and Social Control," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. VII, 1942, pp. 294-299.

lative body is faced with the necessity of enacting new rules for new situations, and the very existence of regularly functioning legislative bodies comes from the recognized need for constantly adapting individual and group behavior to changing conditions.[3]

Inconsistencies in Controls. As long as culture groups remain homogeneous, as far as culture backgrounds, values, and goals are concerned, a high degree of consistency will be found in traditional patterns of control. If groups are heterogeneous, meaning that they have various cultural histories, differing values and goals, then there will be inconsistency in traditional controls.

Where there is inconsistency in traditional controls, little reliance can be placed by the group in automatic controls because they will give no basis for predicting how individuals will behave in given situations, and will lead to conflicts between and among individuals who are guided by differing habitual patterns. Often the inconsistencies will be reflected in the thinking and attitudes of a given individual so that he will be in doubt as to what is right and conforming behavior, and what, on the other hand, is wrong; or he will be in doubt as to which persons represent social authority and which do not.[4]

Such inconsistencies, like social change, give rise to the need for external controls over individuals and, therefore, have contributed to the rise of highly organized governmental schemes.

In considering our own culture group, it can readily be seen that not only is it characterized by rapid and sweeping change, but also it is a heterogeneous culture with a variety of conflicting goals and values and many conflicts of authority. Thus, in our group we would expect, as we find, that great reliance must be placed in formal government and external controls to insure sufficient conformity of individuals to social requirements that our group can function effectively. The transition from the simple tribal life in which automatic controls can be the main reliance for social conformity of individuals, and the conditions found in large modern nations has been a gradual one, and in that transition there is a long period of gradual increase in reliance upon formal government and external controls.

Types of Government

There have been many types of government in different human groups, and modern governments still offer some striking contrasts.

[3] T. V. Smith, "Custom, Gossip, and Legislation," *Social Forces*, Vol XVI, 1937, pp. 24-34.

[4] E. H. Bell, "Age-Group Conflict in Our Changing Culture," *Social Forces*, Vol. XII, 1933, pp. 237-243.

Classification of governmental types depends largely upon the point of view of the classifier, and no complete classification will be attempted here. However, a few outstanding types will be described, simply to give an idea of the range that is encountered in this field, and the variety of possibilities that man has discovered. In considering the types of government it is well to understand that the label which a government attaches to itself is no necessary indication of the kind of government it actually is. At present it is quite usual for governments to call themselves democratic, even though, in many cases they are far from being democratic in form or functioning.

Autocracy. Throughout history, one of the most prevalent types of government has been autocracy, or government in which final authority and responsibility lies in one person who selects others to assist and serve under him. The autocrat has usually come to office through family heredity, the succession to power being automatic with the eldest son taking office when the autocrat dies or becomes otherwise incapacitated to carry out his duties. Elaborate ideologies, including that of the Divine right of kings, have been developed to support such governmental systems.

Such government is relatively simple, and it calls for little from the people who are being governed except strict loyalty and obedience. However, it also lends itself to oppression of the people or some individuals and classes, and there is little protection for personal rights.

Theocracy. In many ways similar to autocratic is theocratic government, in which the priests or heads of religious organizations in a group also conduct civil affairs. In such government there is customarily a hierarchy of control, the positions in which are sometimes hereditary but more often ritualistically determined. In theocratic governments those in authority are presumably under the higher control of Divine law. But since it is a function of those in control to interpret that law, they may well become a law unto themselves.

Under theocratic government the individual again is largely absolved from the necessity of making significant choices for himself, but also has few rights and little protection for his rights. Since the governing group is concerned with religious as well as civil obedience, it penetrates much further into the personal lives of people than does autocratic civil government.

Aristocracy. Aristocracy is found in conjunction with partial autocratic or theocratic government. It is a form of government in which the ruler divides authority and responsibility with an hereditary ruling class,

members of which have their own traditional functions to perform. Such government has been familiar in the history of England, where a hereditary monarch, or autocrat, from very early days, shared governing functions and powers with the members of the nobility. Although the monarch's authority was nominally supreme, there were some functions in which others actually had final decision.

Oligarchy. An oligarchy closely resembles an aristocracy, except that the governing class is not, *per se,* hereditary. Rather the rule is found in a small group because they are the wealthy group, the militarists, or have some other strategic advantage in exerting authority. The control of government is largely by extralegal means rather than through legal channels and represents sheer power to control the decisions and acts of those who govern. Such government is usually in the interest of the few at the expense of the many, and thus leads to oppression and exploitation of the majority.

Democracy. Democracy is the name applied to governments where the majority of the people have a direct or indirect voice in the conduct of government. Regular and legal channels for the expression of the wishes of the majority are provided, and those who function in posts of responsibility and authority must stand for popular election at regular intervals. The ideological justification lies in the notion of popular sovereignty, or the idea that government is rightfully based in the consent of the governed.

We are familiar with the forms of democracy both in our own nation and in other countries much like our own, and some details and problems of democracy will be discussed more in detail later. A few of its outstanding characteristics may be noted at this point. Of all types of government, democracy places greatest emphasis upon, and formal protection about, individual rights. So long as it functions as a democracy it gives least opportunity for exploitation and oppression of the people who live under it, and to a greater extent than other types of government it represents in its decisions compromises among the interests of the people who are governed.

Totalitarian Government. A complex form of autocracy and oligarchy combined has arisen in recent years in many states as totalitarian government. Totalitarian government is so-called because it concentrates in government much wider and sweeping powers than are usually thought of as governmental functions; but equally characteristic is the fact that it is dictatorial, meaning its decisions are made by one or a few persons.

Totalitarian governments have usually preserved some vestige of democratic devices, such as popular elections and parliamentary endorsement of the decisions of the ruling few; but, as will be shown later, such democratic vestiges are robbed of all true democratic meaning through suppression of opposition. Usually associated with totalitarian government is fanatical support from at least a part of the people who are governed, ruthless use of physical force against political opposition, and a strong tendency toward militarism.

Most familiar to us as examples of totalitarian governments are those which governed Italy and Germany at the outbreak of World War II, and that which has governed Russia since the communists have come to power.

Democratic Government

Our own national experience has been with democratic government. We are accustomed to think of government as rightly and expediently resting in the consent of the people who are governed, and in the forms through which a large proportion of the people may express their choice of those who are to carry on the functions of government, and express their preference for laws and governmental forms. We believe that men, no matter what place of power they may occupy, hold it as a trust from the people, and are subject always to the laws. Our officials, from the President down, must take oaths to support the Constitution, the basic law of the land. Our thinking about government places stress upon a long list of specific rights and immunities of individuals insofar as their relations to government are concerned. These ideas, and the forms through which they are carried into execution are a result of a long period of development which antecedes the history of our government itself, having arisen during the evolution of English government, and the struggles of the people of France and other countries against autocracy and aristocracy.

Although there are a few communities in which, at the local level, democracy is still direct, for the most part ours is indirect. In those few communities the adult residents of the community assemble in town meetings to decide matters of policy and elect their governing officers. In indirect democracy determination of policy is carried on, not by the people themselves, but through representatives whom they select to do it for them. We elect city councils or commissions, state legislatures, the Congress, and numerous officials whose function it is to decide policy, enact and administer laws, and, always, to protect rights of individuals and groups subject to the government.[5]

[5] F. H. Giddings, "Social Control in a Democracy," *Proceedings of the American Sociological Society,* Vol. XII, 1917, pp. 201-206.

The Constitution. The American Constitution reflects the distrust of democracy characteristic of the time of its enactment, when large-scale democratic government was still new to man's experience. In the Constitution, the national government was permitted only a few enumerated powers, the remainder being retained by the separate states, which in turn placed restrictions on popular controls at the state governmental level. This division of powers between a central government and subordinate jurisdictions is known as Federal government. In this realm, as in others, there is clear indication of how changing life conditions have met with strong resistance to change in governmental forms and functions, for as the nation has grown, communication and transportation have become facile and rapid, and the original division of powers often tied the national government's hands in attempting to deal with national problems brought about by change. Thus it has been necessary to re-interpret the Constitution on numerous occasions to give the national government powers not specifically delegated to it.

Reflecting the same basic distrust of democracy the Constitution contains an elaborate system of checks and balances. The powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government are separated, and each branch is given powers to check the activities of the others. Only the legislative branch may enact laws and appropriate money, but enactments of the legislative body are subject both to the executive veto and to judicial review by the Supreme Court. In addition, the two houses of the Congress are based upon different kinds of representation and their members have differing terms of office. The two houses have somewhat different functions and powers, and each may effectively check the activities of the other.

A further precaution is found in the difficulties which were placed in the way of amending the Constitution itself. In all our history of rapid social change, the Constitution has been amended only twenty-one times, the first ten amendments (the Bill of Rights) having been adopted in the first few years of our national history. In a century and a half of our national history there have been only eleven amendments to the Constitution.[6]

English Parliamentary Government. The extremes to which the framers of the American Constitution went in providing safeguards against the presumed dangers of democracy are clearly brought out if we compare our form with that of English government, which despite its vestiges of autocracy and aristocracy, is generally recognized as democratic in its functioning.

[6] Of the latter eleven amendments, two canceled each other; the eighteenth enabling prohibition legislation, and the twenty-first repealing the eighteenth.

There is no written English Constitution in the sense that we have a Constitution. Each enactment of the English parliament is, in effect, an amendment to its unwritten constitution, or body of ruling precedents. English government is unitary rather than federal, which means that the authority and sovereignty reside in the national government rather than being divided between it and subordinate jurisdictions which would correspond to our states.

The executive in English government is a group of men selected from parliament and responsible to it. The parliament may remove these men at will, and although they are leaders of parliament while they remain in office, they have no such veto power as resides in the President of the United States. The British cabinet, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, has wide powers in conducting governmental affairs, but its policies and membership are always subject to the legislative body.

Similarly, the parliament itself functions as the Supreme Court in English government, and thus there is no power outside parliament to declare its enactments unconstitutional. Although the English parliament is made up of two houses, one of these houses has been so stripped of its governmental powers that, while it may delay or criticize the enactments of the other, it cannot, in the same sense as in our Congress, check the other.

Thus we see in another democracy the concentration of governmental powers in a single governing body, the elected parliament, and in a single house of the parliament.

How Government Functions. If one had only the Constitution to use in judging our form of government it would not be at all clear how our government could function at all, or with sufficient flexibility to meet the demands of rapid and insistent social change. One reason why it can function, not apparent in the Constitution, lies in the powers of courts to interpret laws. This power is usually considered as conservative, and in the short-run may well give that impression as it is and has been exercised; but considering our whole national history it may well be regarded as one of the principal sources of governmental change. The courts may say what the words which make up our laws and our Constitution mean, and thus may change laws. As the courts have changed their ideas as to what is proper and fitting to the time, the form and powers of our government have changed.

Despite the numerous impasses that are made possible and even inevitable in our systems of checks and balances, our form of government has been able to function effectively throughout our national history through the development of numerous extralegal devices which were not

envisioned by those who framed the Constitution. Such devices are usually generalized under the term politics, and, as will be shown in the next chapter, it is politics which makes it possible for us to have a going democracy within the framework of our Constitutional forms.

The Nature of Laws

The term "law," in connection with government, refers to commands issued by those in legal authority which are binding upon all or some of those who are subject to the government. The laws in our governmental system fall into a hierarchy in which three levels may be defined. The first level is that of Constitutional law, which includes our national and state constitutions and the amendments to these constitutions; treaties with other nations; and precedents established by our courts in the interpretation of constitutional laws. These laws set limits on those who are empowered to enact laws and are the basis from which all other laws gain their validity.

Next in the hierarchy is enacted law, or the acts which are passed by our legislative bodies, the Congress, state legislatures, and county and municipal governing groups. Such laws are usually called statutes at the Federal and state level, and ordinances at the local and community level. They are binding on the people within the jurisdiction of the legislative body only insofar as they are in accordance with the more fundamental constitutional laws.

The third level of laws in the hierarchy are the rules and regulations set up by executives and administrators in order to carry out the enactments of the legislative groups. Such rules and regulations have the same authority as enacted laws as long as they are in keeping with the statutes and do not violate constitutional laws, it being presumed that unless powers are specifically delegated by legislative groups to those who must apply their laws, such powers as are necessary so to do may be presumed to have been intended. It is this latter type of law which has been highly controverted in our government; and the exercise of rights to issue rules and regulations having the force of law has been considered one of the sources of the greatest abuses of bureaucracy.

In addition to statutory law, and on the same level, is common law, which is a body of precedent built up by court decisions throughout Anglo-Saxon and American legal history. Being based upon precedent, common law is conservative and is therefore poorly adapted to meet new and unprecedented problems and situations. Somewhat more flexible is equity law, which permits informal procedures and adaptations to change.

Administration and Enforcement. Once enacted or decreed, laws must be put into actual operation.[7] Often laws provide for administrative agencies or for application by already existing agencies; and criminal laws, of course, are enforced by police agencies and officers of various kinds. In our own governmental system the President is the chief executive in the national government, and the various governors in the state governments. The members of the President's cabinet are the chief administrators of the departments of the national government, of which there are nine, the State Department, Treasury, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, Post Office Department, and Department of Justice. The number of departments, and therefore the number of cabinet members, varies through time, the usual trend having been toward more and more departments, but a recent change reduced the number by one when it combined the War Department and Navy Department into a single department.

Within each of the main administrative departments which are charged with applying laws, there are bureaus and agencies, each with a chief administrator and a field force. For example, in the Department of Agriculture are the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and numerous other administrative agencies. In the Treasury Department are the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Secret Service, and others.

Also, at the national level, there are numerous so-called independent agencies which do not come under the supervision of any of the main departments of the government, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Security Agency, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Such independent agencies are directly responsible to the President and are a flexible phase of government designed to meet new conditions.[8]

The administrative organization of the national government is paralleled by state governments, and to some extent by county and municipal governments. The number of administrative agencies at all governmental levels in the United States charged with carrying out the laws enacted by legislative bodies runs into many thousands, and the entire network of such agencies is so complex that it offers baffling problems of coordination.

There are several million persons engaged in administering the national laws, and other millions engaged in administering state and

[7] Pendleton Herring, "Executive-Legislative Responsibilities," *American Political Science Review,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1944, pp. 1153-1156.

[8] E. S. Griffith, "The Changing Pattern of Public Policy Formation," *American Political Science Review,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1944, pp. 445-459.

local laws. The total number of persons engaged in applying and enforcing laws at all levels in this country is nearly six million, or about one person out of every twenty-five in the population. This great number of public servants is often referred to as Bureaucracy and presents many problems. The number of laws they are called upon to put in operation and enforce runs into the hundreds of thousands.

Although the interpretation of laws is formally a function of the courts, those engaged in applying the laws to particular situations must use discretion which often extends to impromptu interpretations. They must also select among the many laws those which they shall apply and enforce, and those which they shall not; and which rigidly and to the letter, and which loosely.

Since the legislators cannot themselves enforce the laws they enact, or decide just how such laws shall apply to every situation that may arise, the administrators, to a large extent, are the actual determiners of law, because it is they who actually make the detailed application. There are many hundreds of laws on various statute and ordinance books which are not enforced. This is sometimes dramatized in the articles which are written upon ancient "blue laws" which are found in the statutes of many states, but which are so antiquated that they are seldom or never enforced; but it may be much more realistically seen in the administrative and police activities of any city government, where many ordinances are simply ignored most of the time.

The Courts. The courts, in our governmental system, are set up primarily to protect the rights of individuals and such quasi-individuals as corporations. The main part of their procedure, as the jury trial, the presumption of innocence, and the right of defendants to legal representation are designed to insure that government enforcement officers and agencies do not encroach upon individual rights which are all important in democracy.

Every real or quasi-individual presumably has access to the courts when his rights are invaded or threatened, even though the invasion is by legally constituted authority. This is at once the pride and a weakness of democracy, as most students of the democratic system are agreed. It means that everyone has the protection of the government, even against governmental authority, but it also means that those who violate laws may use legal processes to evade penalties or inhibit enforcement.

Courts most usually function after administrative personnel and agencies have applied laws. They decide upon the jurisdiction of the person or agency enforcing the law, the meaning of the law, and the facts in the particular situation. This means that courts, in many ways. are the true makers of laws, because they make the crucial decisions,

reaching even to constitutionality, and therefore the enforceability, of laws. They may or may not agree with the legislators, the administrative and enforcement officials, but their decision is final. It may be appealed to higher courts, but ultimately, under our system of government, courts decide what the law is and how it applies to any particular situation.

Other important functions of our courts are implied in such activities as the issuance of writs of *mandamus,* injunctions, and *quo warranto* writs. A writ of *mandamus* may command an administrative official to enforce a particular law in a particular case. The injunction may be issued against a citizen or group of citizens believed to have intentions of violating laws, forbidding them so to do under the threat of penalties for contempt of court. The writ of *quo warranto* challenges a governmental office holder to show by what authority he holds office.

Governmental Interrelationships

The complexity of modern government is illustrated in our own local, state, and national systems in which there may be found complex interrelationships and overlappings among the principal branches of government. As has been noted, executive and administrative personnel and agencies may assume some legislative functions in making rules and regulations which have the force of law. They may also assume judicial functions when they set up tribunals to hear complaints and adjudicate particular cases.

Courts, clearly, may assume legislative functions when they declare what the law means, because that is equivalent to enacting laws. The courts may also assume administrative functions in applying laws to particular cases or classes of cases.

Legislative bodies have shown a tendency to assume judicial functions, as illustrated in the committee hearings of legislative bodies which involve the determination of whether individuals and corporations are involved in violations of laws. They may also assume administrative functions when they include within laws stipulations as to policy and procedure for carrying out the laws.

Such overlappings, and resultant confusions, are largely the result of the very complexity of modern social organizations and the increasing need for formal external controls. They are a concern of political scientists.

External Affairs

Every national government presents to the world external to its own jurisdictional limits an aspect which in many ways is different from that

which faces its own subjects or citizens. In relations to other national governments, each, supposedly, has sovereignty, which means that it is responsible to no power higher than itself. To suffer any impairment of that sovereignty is considered a breach of national honor, and it occurs only in the face of vastly superior power. Although there are numerous agencies in international relations which presumably have some precedence over the notion of national sovereignty, such supernational powers remain poorly defined and precarious, especially where the "great powers" are concerned.

The whole morality of government is different in its external aspects from what it is in internal affairs. Even democracies can brook no opposition from their own citizens and agencies to the official governmental policies abroad; and whereas the relation of government to citizens and subjects may be one which places highest values on the rights and freedoms of individuals, in external affairs every government must use whatever means contribute to a single paramount end, that of survival in a potentially hostile world. Not only survival, but national self-interest, may be pursued abroad in ways which would not, in many cases, be permissible to governments in handling their own domestic affairs.

Foreign Policy. Every government must, to be effective in the pursuit of its national interest and long-run considerations of survival, have a foreign policy that is more or less recognized by other governments as marking the course of actions which may be anticipated from it in its international dealings. The foreign policy of every government includes defense of its own sovereignty and territory, and usually certain rights for its citizens and interests at sea or abroad. The United States historically held a foreign policy which was loosely described as "isolationism," or the dependence on its ocean frontiers and the relative weakness of land neighbors to remain aloof from most international controversies. However, even under such a policy, the American government made frequent excursions into distant fields to interfere in matters which seemed to affect our national interests. Quite early in our national history we were at war with pirates in the Mediterranean Sea. Later we were upholding an open-door in China and were instrumental in forcing an opening of the Japanese islands to foreign trade. From quite early in our national history we have maintained the Monroe Doctrine, an assertion of our sphere of influence in Latin America, which excluded European nations from interfering in affairs of, or attempting to conquer, the republics to the south of us.

The Second World War effectively ended any possibility of isolationism in our foreign policy when we emerged as the strongest power among

the nations and the only one with the possible strength to maintain world peace and stability. At the end of the war we added two definite items to our foreign policy—the aim of containing Soviet Russia within her "sphere of influence," and that of supporting and working through the United Nations in the hope that this organization might eventually become strong enough to take over the responsibility for world peace and stability.

International Government. Historically there have been numerous efforts to set up partial or complete international government, the most recent being represented by the United Nations. Presumably patterned after the federated type of internal government, the United Nations has a parliamentary assembly for discussion and debate of international problems; and a Security Council of the more powerful states' representatives to make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature where the sovereignties of nations appear to be involved. There is also an international tribunal to which member nations may appeal disputes which involve international law. There are also numerous administrative and investigative agencies for studying and recommending programs of various kinds at the international level.

International government as yet has no sufficient police powers or force to enforce decisions which are strong enough to command the respect of the more powerful nations; and such decisions depend upon the prestige of the nations which concur in them. It is the hope of internationalists that eventually international governmental organization and institutions may assume sufficient power, even in areas now strictly reserved to the control of sovereign nations, to establish and guarantee a lasting world order. This development, if possible, remains for the future.

Summary

Organized government of some form is found in all group life, but with the decline of the effectiveness of the automatic social controls of tradition and custom, formal governmental devices have been greatly expanded. There are a variety of forms of government including the present markedly contrasting democratic and dictatorial types. In democratic government, the power of government is justified as coming from consent of the governed, and emphasis is placed upon protection of the rights and freedoms of individuals and such quasi-individuals as corporations.

Our own democratic form of government is characterized by checks and balances in the divisions of powers among the legislative, executive,

and judicial branches; and between the central national government and the subordinate jurisdictions, principally the states. This latter division is referred to as Federal government. Although it was intended by the framers of the Constitution that most of the powers should reside in the states, changing conditions have made necessary an almost continuous shift of power to the central government.

In the international field, governments present somewhat different aspects from those recognized in internal affairs. The theory of sovereignty makes each national government the ultimate judge of its own activities; and all else in the international field must be subordinated to considerations of national survival in a potentially hostile world and to considerations of national self-interest. Efforts have been made increasingly to establish partial or complete government at the international level, the latest attempt being the United Nations. In form, at least, the United Nations is a reconstruction of Federal parliamentary government as found in numerous nations; but as yet this international government lacks the police power to enforce its decisions against the stronger nations.

Terms

Automatic controls
Autocracy
Theocracy
Aristocracy
Oligarchy
Democracy
Totalitarian
Checks and balances
Federal
Parliamentary
Precedent
Executive
Judiciary
Legislative
Sovereignty

Questions

1. What is the relationship of traditional and customary guides to behavior to formal governmental controls?
2. How may the emphasis placed by democracies on the rights of individuals be considered both a strength and a weakness?
3. Why is it possible to give several answers to the questions of who makes the laws in our own country?
4. What is meant by bureaucracy? What major criticisms are made of bureaucracy?
5. How has governmental change been possible in the United States despite rigidity of the Constitution?
6. What are the principal items in the foreign policy of the United States?

READING LIST

T. W. Arnold, *The Symbols of Government.* Yale University Press, 1935.
L. L. Bernard, *Social Control in its Sociological Aspects.* The Macmillan Co., 1939.
M. R. Cohen, *Law and the Social Order.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1933.

B. J. Cordozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process.* Yale University Press, 1921.
S. J. Hemleben, *Plans for World Peace Through Six Centuries.* University of Chicago Press, 1943.
H. Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study of Its Origins and Backgrounds.* The Macmillan Co., 1945.
Paul H. Landis, *Social Control: Social Organization and Disorganization in Process.* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939.
Roscoe Pound, *Social Control Through Law.* Yale University Press, 1942.
Joseph S. Roucek (ed.), *Social Control.* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.
W. F. Willoughby, *The Government of Modern States.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

CHAPTER XVII

Invisible Government

Democracy is not spontaneous, and it does not exist entirely in any form of government which is described in constitutional law. Notably, in our own form of government, with its checks and balances, there would be no possibility of continuous functioning except for elaborate mechanisms which exist outside of the legal provisions and which serve as the tie between the people and their governmental machinery. It is in the extralegal mechanisms that the art of practical politics finds scope, and their operations are principally the function of the professional politician. Although it is true that there are many abuses in political organizations and activities, their socially essential functions must be borne in mind if we are to gain a clear understanding of them.

Examples of Political Functions

Because of the form of the United States national government, there are many occasions upon which impasses arise. Often the two houses of the Congress are in disagreement on the precise form a piece of legislation should take, and yet, unless they enact identical bills, the legislation cannot become effective. It is here that practical politics and extralegal machinery become necessary to bring about agreement in a joint committee of the two houses, the agreement involving compromise in which each must give in on some points in order to gain others. Politics is essentially the art of reaching compromises, because in a democracy there are necessarily many interests and points of view, and only by bringing them into working agreements can there be functioning government.

Often, in facing a national crisis, the President, as policy leader for the national government, feels it expedient to determine in advance what support he may expect from the legislative branch of government. He may, and often does, call into conference the leaders of the major political parties, and again a successful conference results in compromise of varying viewpoints. If agreement is reached, the President feels safe in proceeding to make commitments which can only be fulfilled by legis-

lation at a later time, because there is some degree of discipline in political parties, which means that party members in the Congress will feel morally bound, to some extent, by promises made by their leaders. What discipline there is of party members and their representatives in office is not a function of formal government, but of extralegal party organization. It is effective because office holders owe their election to their political parties, and further aims which they may have can only be reached if they have the support of their parties.

When elections are planned it is essential that suitable candidates present themselves as aspirants for the various posts to be filled. Since, to become a candidate means sacrifices of various kinds for the individual, there would be few candidates unless they had some advance assurance that they might be elected. Here, again, political organization serves a vital function in democracy, for such organizations can find suitable candidates and bring them before the people.

On election days, large numbers of persons who are qualified to vote are reluctant to go to the trouble of casting their ballots. It may be inconvenient, or they may have other things on their minds. Political organizations serve, more or less effectively, to urge and actually bring people to the polling places and to get them to vote.

Many other examples could be given of the services of practical politics in making democracy function. Without the activities and organizations which are included in the term politics and without the constant preoccupation with such activities and organizations on the part of professional politicians, government, in democracies, would be spasmodic, unpredictable, and, in the long run, unworkable.

Political Parties

Political parties exist in all modern democracies, but they are unique to democracies. Countries which do not have democratic forms of government also have one or more political parties which advocate various general lines of policy for the government. The modern totalitarian state is characterized, more than by any other single thing, by a one-party system of politics. Only the party in active support of the government is permitted to function or even to exist. There can be no rival or opposition party. Thus it is that the political organization is the extralegal arm of the legal government and is often quite as effective in establishing and maintaining dictatorial controls as is the government itself. The principal difference between democracy and dictatorial government lies, not in the formal and legal government, but in the informal and extralegal political organization. This explains why it is possi-

ble for the Soviet Union of Russia to have, what in form is, a democratic constitution, but, in fact, no functioning democratic institutions.[1]

Multiple-Party Systems. Most countries which have any democracy have multiple-party systems of politics. This means that they have more than two political parties which count materially in elections and the determination of policies. Seldom, in such countries, does any one party have a clear majority of parliamentary votes, so that coalitions both in support of and in opposition to the government in power are necessary. In such coalitions the members and representatives of two or more parties reach a sufficient working compromise on their immediate objectives to make it possible for them to function for a time as though they were a single party. Multiple-party systems are marked, usually, but not always, with more frequent shifts in governmental personnel and policy than is the government in a country which has a two-party system. This means greater flexibility but less stability for the government.

The Two-Party System. In the United States we have had historically a two-party system. Although we have usually had a number of organized and functioning political parties, except on rare occasions only the two dominant parties—now the Democratic and the Republican—have been strong enough to win national elections and assume the prerogatives and responsibilities of government. It has been the function of the major party not in power to serve as the opposition to the government, holding its policies and performance up for constant critical examination. What is true of the national government is usually true of state and local government—the rule and opposition of two major parties. The party in power quite often is able to maintain itself in power for several terms and throughout a number of elections, largely because of the prestige and emoluments which go with the conduct of the government. But eventually the opposition party has been able to capitalize on the accumulated errors and misfortunes of the party in power, and in turn assume control of the government. Such changes, coming at intervals of eight, or twelve, or more years, has meant that our government has been relatively stable in policy and personnel.[2]

Party Organization. Within each political party there is a situation

[1] J. O. Hertzler, "Totalitarian Ways of Life," Chapter XXVIII in Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, *Social Control*, D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947, especially pp. 514ff.

[2] The Republicans won the national presidential election of 1860 and remained in power until 1884; a Democratic President was elected that year, and the Democrats remained in power until 1896, when the Republicans again took over. Republicans then remained in power until 1912, when the Democrats came into power for eight years, to be followed by twelve years of Republican domination. The Democrats have been in power since 1932.

analogous to that in the government where many parties compete for control. In each political party there are a few professional politicians who control the party to a large extent; there are others, either professional politicians or not, who constantly strive to wrest party control from them. Especially is such competition keen within the party which is in power at a given time, and often it leads to breaking the party into factions which may so weaken it as to hasten a change in administration, placing the rival party in power.

The professional politicians are those who devote all or most of their time and energy to party organizational affairs, and usually they depend upon such political activity for their livings. Professional politicians often are criticized for their activities, but it is difficult to see how we could have continuing or effective party organization unless there were numerous individuals who did give their entire time and attention to practical politics.

In addition to the few politicians who are in control of the party, there are committees of citizens who are not professional politicians but who are sufficiently interested in the success of one party or another to help form party policies and educate followers to accept and support such policies. Each party has a national committee, state committees, county, and local committees.

The politicians and committees at the top level receive most attention in political parties, but the actual work of the organization is carried out at levels much closer to the voters, in the wards and precincts. At these levels, the voters themselves are organized, small favors are done, and the loyalty and support necessary to winning elections are gained. It is the thousands of little-known petty politicians, some professional, others not, who determine success or failure of a party.

Parties as Compromise Groups. Within either of the major political parties in this country there is a wide variety of component elements, held together and able to function through the politicians' art of compromise. There are rural party organizations and city political "machines"; regional organizations and national interests; professional, business, and labor groups and organizations; women's groups and men's; young voters and organizations of the aged; racial and ethnic organizations and groups; church groups and underworld organizations; and others, too numerous to list. When it is considered that each party is an amalgamation of such diverse and contrasting interests, the political skill of organizational leaders can be appreciated for its great importance.

The need for compromise of many and varied interests may be seen preceding elections when the parties adopt and publish "platforms," or lists of policies which they, as party organizations, presumably support

and will be guided by if elected to power. It is traditional that each platform must contain one or more "planks" (that is, specific proposals) to appeal to each of the major component groups within the party—a labor plank, a farm plank, a plank for the aged, a plank for women, etc.

How Parties Are Supported. Political parties not only need the services of professional full-time workers; they also must have money to print circulars and booklets, purchase advertising space in newspapers and time on the radio, pay telephone and telegraph bills, rent office space, and for numerous other purposes. These expenses are heaviest just preceding an election, but they are also continuous at times when no election is imminent; party organizations must be kept functioning at all times to serve their purpose effectively. Even though political parties are necessary to the functioning of democracy, there is no legal provision in this country for meeting the expenses of party organization. It is necessary for each party to resort to extralegal means of supporting itself and meeting its expenses.

The party in power places its principal reliance in various ways of diverting governmental positions to party supporters. Patronage, or the giving of governmental positions to party workers and supporters, is the principal way of meeting party obligations. Even though most governmental positions are under merit systems, and therefore do not lend themselves readily to patronage purposes, there remain a large number at all levels which may be given out at the discretion of the executives who have been put in office by one of the political parties. Those who receive such appointments, or those who anticipate them if their parties are successful, then donate money, time, or both, to the party organization. Many professional politicians have held government jobs of one kind or another throughout their working years.

Since the party in power may determine which laws will be enforced, and how rigorously, party organizations, especially at the local levels, may barter "protection" to those engaged in enterprises which are in danger of legal interference. In many cities and counties there exist alliances, some relatively permanent, others quite temporary, between underworld persons and organizations and political party organizations. In such alliances those in need of "protection" donate money to the political party in return for actual protection, or in the expectation of protection should the party be successful in an election. Protection is not only an extralegal devise for supporting political organizations, but usually it is also illegal, that is, willful evasion of law on the part of the politicians who arrange the alliances.

Other favors which political parties may give to supporters when they have control of government, in exchange for financial support, are usu

ally called "graft." Governmental units, and especially at the local level, may give franchises and contracts which are lucrative to supporters; may purchase land or sell land under conditions favorable to individuals; and otherwise may benefit some persons at the general expense of the taxpayers. Most of such practices are illegal, but others are sometimes referred to as "honest graft," meaning that they are presumed to lie within the letter of the law.[3]

In periods just preceding major elections, political parties make direct solicitations for funds from individuals, business firms, and various kinds of organizations. In such solicitations money may be donated to the political parties with no expectation of return other than the satisfaction of having supported one's convictions as represented by the party policies; but quite often there is the expectation by the giver, whether expressed or not, that more tangible returns will be forthcoming, especially if the supported party succeeds in gaining governmental power. Some individuals and organizations make it a practice to contribute at campaign time to both contending major parties as a kind of political "insurance."

Legal Restrictions. The various practices which have been described for securing the necessary financial support for political parties suggest the possibility of wholesale political corruption, and at many times and in many places such corruption has reached the dimensions of national or local scandals. There is a long history of national, state, and local legislation designed to curb corrupt practices, which have lessened some of the more obvious evils. One has been in the form of laws requiring political parties and candidates to publish financial statements following campaigns to show the amount and sources of money spent. Others have been laws forbidding solicitation of funds from office holders, limitations on the size of individual contributions to political parties, and laws which have forbidden some organizations, such as labor unions, from using funds for political purposes. One of the most important types of reform, however, has been to extend the civil service or merit system controls to more and more public appointive offices. Under such laws office holders are selected in competitive examinations, on the basis of predetermined qualifications for the work involved, and without reference to political affiliations. Such laws may be quite effective curbs on patronage, depending upon how well and honestly they are administered.

As yet no legal answer has been found to the basic problem from

[3] To give advance information to persons in a position to invest as to the location of a new park, or of land which will be needed for certain civic improvements are examples.

which corruption stems—the growing need for dependable sources of income which political parties feel on the one hand, and lack of legal provision for the support of such parties on the other. Proposals have been made that governmental funds be given to political parties to meet their financial needs, but obvious difficulties stand in the way of such measures, since they would place the party out of power at the mercy of the party in control of the government.

Special Phases

The City Machine. Many of the problems of the political party as an extralegal agency of government are brought out in the history of the city political machine, which has been an important component of national and state political parties throughout most of American history. Although the abuses which have been found in city machine politics have had widespread publicity, it is probable that they have been but little different from abuses found elsewhere on a less concentrated and spectacular scale.

The prototype of the American city machine is usually considered to be Tammany Hall, a political organization of New York City which has functioned as an element in the national and state Democratic party as-well as being a dominant force in city politics. Starting as a mutual aid society to help immigrant Irish to adjust themselves to the new world at the time when the Irish influx bulked large in our total immigration, the society soon developed political power through the loyalty of the new arrivals. It found that by having political influence it was in a position to render countless small favors to the hard-pressed immigrants and their families and to others who lived in poverty. Such favors included getting a job for a family member, "squaring" a police charge, the temporary loan of a small sum of money, or a gift of food to a distressed family.

Allowing for a few brief and exceptional intervals, Tammany Hall leaders were able to dominate New York City politics for generations. Through such domination, often they were able to play a principal role in state and national politics. Protests against the corrupt practices employed by Tammany Hall—practices which often enriched her leaders—brought a series of reform movements, some of which succeeded in removing the organization from power for a few years.

As the immigrant floods spread to other rapidly growing cities of the country, the pattern of Tammany Hall, with local variations, repeated itself in city after city. It depended, for successful operation, on close organization and discipline, usually with dictatorial domination at the top by one man or a small group of men. Often the "boss" operated

from behind the scenes, as far as the public was concerned, not running for public office, but directing those who did. Those in positions of power in the government were often "henchmen" of the boss, who was the one who determined policies.

With the change in the character of immigration following 1880, political power tended to lie in the control of other national-origin groups—such as Italian and Polish immigrants—but the pattern remained essentially the same. When the quota law brought large-scale immigration to an end, the growing Negro population of some cities became a balance of power in local politics, and, to some extent, replaced immigrant groups as the basis of local political control.

Between 1920 and 1930 the preponderance of the population of this country, and therefore of voting strength, shifted from rural communities to urban communities, and largely to the greater cities. This made it more necessary for state politicians and national leaders to concern themselves with city politics directly instead of, as before, simply working out the best trades they could with the city bosses. By increasing the amount of state and Federal patronage in cities, and appealing directly to city voters, outside influences became more and more influential in city elections, weakening the previous unchallenged control of the local bosses.

To an increasing extent, city political organizations must look to state and national organizations for support in order to maintain their control even in local elections. This has been a part of a general centralizing trend in both legal government and extralegal politics which makes the national capital more and more the center of prestige and influence for every level of political and governmental activity.

The Solid South. One of the special phases of American politics which has been an important element in national politics, and therefore in national government, has been the "solid South." Early in our history the southeastern cotton and tobacco producing states had played a dominant role in national affairs due largely to population concentration and wealth. As the period of Civil War approached, the preponderance of both population and wealth had shifted to the more rapidly industrializing northern states with a corresponding decline in southern strength in national affairs. This shift was partly responsible for the crisis which brought about the southern secession and the Civil War. Following the Civil War the Reconstruction period brought much bitter resentment among the leaders in southern states, and they forged an effective united front in politics—the solid Democratic South. In part this effective political union was based upon common interests, largely economic; in part it was an outgrowth of fierce loyalties engendered during the Civil

War; but in part it also contained some elements of single party systems everywhere, the suppression of effective opposition. Especially has this been notable in the effective disfranchisement of the southern Negroes through various devices including, at times, violence and the threat of violence.[4]

So dominant has the local and state Democratic party organization of the South been, since the time of the Reconstruction period, that it is axiomatic in nearly all communities and states of the region that the primary election is the only effectively contested election; and the actual election is only a formality. The Solid South has meant a large block of dependable votes in national elections and in the houses of Congress.

The Farm Vote. Numerically, there are more farmers in the South than in any other region, but their voting strength is so completely absorbed in the Solid South that the "farm vote" is a term usually used for the special interest agricultural groups of the Middle West and other agricultural areas. Although the American farmer is notably individualistic and difficult to organize in other respects, in politics he has presented a remarkably united front on issues which presumably affect his economic welfare. So true has this been that in national politics, and in many states, it has been necessary to make many special appeals and concessions to the "farm vote." The farmers, insofar as they have presented a somewhat united front, have given complete allegiance to neither of the major parties, except as appeared to suit their special interests at a particular time, and this vote has always been a fertile ground for developing third party movements in attempts to challenge the dominance of the two major parties.

In the history of American politics, and especially before the shift of population to a predominantly urban population, the farm vote has often been in the position of balance of power between the two major parties and thus has determined which party would win at the national election. As will be noted later, organizations of farmers and livestock growers have long maintained strong lobbies in Washington to look after their legislative interests.

The Labor Vote. From time to time the vote of organized labor has been a decisive one in national, state, and local politics, but it is only in the last generation that it has become a consideration of importance equal to, or even surpassing, that of the farm vote. There are several reasons why it had not been so important in the past. The labor movement in this country, until recently, has been exclusive, tending to keep out

[4] See Stanley F. Horn, *K.K.K.; Invisible Empire*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939; and John M. Mecklin, *The Ku Klux Klan*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1924.

the great majority of workers in order to protect the employment of a relatively few. It has also been traditional policy of American labor, until quite recently, to refrain from partisan politics as such, and simply to pick policies and candidates, usually at the lower levels of politics, upon which to concentrate their support or opposition.

With the recent development of industrial unionism, as represented by the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the labor movement has changed its character with important results for partisan politics. It has tended to seek numbers and to include larger and larger proportions of the workers in its ranks; and it has concerned itself more and more with influencing national governmental policies and therefore with national politics.

In recent years, organized labor, concentrated in the larger industrial cities, has come to occupy, at times, the balance of power position upon which not only local and state elections might depend, but also national elections.

Considering that the labor movement itself has been torn by internecine strife, it has rapidly come into a position of great importance in partisan politics at all levels and must necessarily be considered by major parties in their efforts to gain or keep control of government at all levels.

The Third Party. Only a few times in national politics and in a few areas in state politics, has a third party movement been of sufficient importance to greatly influence the competition between the two major parties. The American partisan political structure, except for the Solid South, has shown sufficient flexibility and fluidity to absorb protest movements which expressed major discontent with both major parties before such discontent could lend itself to effective third party organization. There is a strong appeal for American voters in slogans as the "party of Jefferson" or the "party of Lincoln"—appeals to tradition as the best guide through our governmental troubles. Third parties, lacking historical continuity, can only cry for change. They lack any adequate substitute for the appeal made by older parties to the distant past for authority. This illustrates, in the political realm, the reluctance of the people to launch into uncharted paths, and their inclination to cling, at least symbolically, to the precedents coming down from experience.

Although the two major parties dominate the political scene in this country, there are always numerous other parties, some with a considerable history, at the national, state, and local levels. One perennial protest party has been the Socialist Party, which has never figured importantly in a national election, and only in rare instances at the state

and local level, but which always attracts some votes from those who are dissatisfied with both major parties. Another has been the Prohibition Party which is an organization that has been a rallying point for organizations and individuals with a specific program to promote. This party, focal point for a considerable sentiment, has never been in a position to win elections, but has been able to effect sufficient pressure at various political levels to bring about reforms, at least temporary, in laws designed to control the liquor traffic. A recent development has been the Townsend organization which has functioned as a protest party to promote particular reforms favoring the insecure aged persons, who have been increasing as a distinct element in the population. At the local and state level, the American Labor Party has become influential in New York City and state politics, having had the balance of power in both levels in some recent elections.

The Patchwork of American Politics. From the descriptions which have been given of examples of organizations within and outside the major political parties, it may readily be seen that to simply see partisan politics as recurring struggles for power between two major parties is quite unrealistic. The struggle is much more complicated and involves many types of interests and organizations at all levels. The two-party system, on close examination, comes to bear more and more resemblance to the multiple-party system as found, for instance, in France; but the struggle in America usually takes place within the party organizations rather than in the formal government. The task of each major party is to bring about working compromises among as many of the lesser political elements of the country, or state, or locality, as it can, and on its success in bringing about such compromises depends its success at the polls.

The platforms upon which the major parties enter into election campaigns may best be understood as a public statement in very general and necessarily flexible terms of the kind of compromise which has been reached and is offered to the great variety of interest groups who make up the qualified voters of the area in which the election is being held.

Pressure Groups

Even when a major party is successful in bringing about a sufficiently effective compromise among a variety of elements to win an election, it remains an uneasy alliance among many kinds of interests. This means that the government which is controlled by a major party, by virtue of its having won the election, must be ever sensitive to demands of interest groups whose support it will continue to need in order to win future

elections. Such a government is susceptible to pressures brought by interest groups at every stage of policy formation and enactment, and even in choosing persons to fill responsible posts.

Lobbies. Thus, of great importance in the operation of government at all levels are the pressure groups, which have no legal basis in the government, but which often are as important as the legally constituted government itself in deciding issues. Such pressure groups always represent minorities with special interests at stake. They operate in numerous ways but most effectively and immediately by maintaining lobbies in the national or state capitals, or even at lower levels of government. Such lobbies perform services for legislators and administrators, since they are often composed of experts in various fields able to advise on laws and the administration of laws which effect those fields. Since government must deal with every segment of a highly complex national life, it is impossible for legislators and administrators to be well versed in the details of all of them, and to have such expert knowledge and advice readily at hand may be of great value to them.

The purpose of each lobby, however, is to protect and further the interests of some special interest in the economy or the national life. The lobby may consist of a single individual—usually a lawyer and former government official or legislator who knows his "way around" in the capital; or of a staff of several persons, depending upon the size and importance of the special interest concerned. The lobbyists attempt by various means, usually legal but not always, to win support among legislators and administrators for their particular programs, or against proposals inimical to their interests. They may do this by giving favors to legislators and officials with the implicit expectations of favors in return; by helping members of their families to attain social prestige; by simple persuasion and argument; and by a host of other means. They may also see to it that their interests receive publicity through press and radio releases and interviews so as to gain popular support and approval, which in turn will affect politically conscious office holders.

Other Activities. In addition to maintaining lobbies at capitals, pressure groups engage in other related enterprises. Many of them contribute to, or help raise funds for, political parties, and act much as political parties in getting candidates favorable to them to run for office, and in getting out votes in support of the candidates. Some of them maintain elaborate temporary or permanent propaganda organizations, issue their own literature or periodicals, or work through other media. Some maintain staffs of trained lawyers to assist in court controversies which affect their interests and causes.

It would be almost impossible to list all the pressure groups in the United States, or even those which are most active at a particular time. Nearly every organization other than purely "social" clubs, ranging from teachers' associations to the National Brewers' Foundation, and from local women's clubs to the National Association of Manufacturers, functions at some time as a pressure group to affect politics or governmental policies and administration. Not all of these are conscious of themselves as being pressure groups, even though they may urge their members to send letters and telegrams to their congressmen regarding certain issues; not all have pressure politics as their principal, or even as an important part of their general program; and not all maintain lobbies; but the general principle and methods involved are basically the same.

The essential function that such groups serve, like that of political parties, is apt to be lost sight of in the abuses which often creep into their activities, abuses which at times have extended to outright bribery of officials or legislators. They do serve to keep effective touch between people and their governments in a democracy, and to give politicians and officials a means of roughly gauging the strength of sentiments in favor of or against proposals which would otherwise be lacking, for few individuals have the time or the awareness to make their sentiments known unless prodded and urged by some organization. Individuals, as such, could have little or no effect on the government which presumably serves them and must make their voices heard through organized activity and weight of numbers.

Curbs on Pressure Groups. There are numerous laws at various governmental levels intended to curb and control the practices of pressure groups, especially the practices which are considered most inimical to the public interest. Federal law and the laws of many states require that lobbyists register and declare the amount of the salaries paid them, as well as other details of their activities. There are stringent laws against bribery and other activities, and frequent legislative and judicial investigations have served to keep the public aware of their activities. More constructive measures have been those of setting up legislative bureaus and other organizations to perform for legislators some of the functions of furnishing detailed and expert knowledge, for which they have been highly dependent upon lobbyists.

The organization of pressure groups themselves, however, is considered as among the necessary prerogatives of free representative governments, and their suppression would be a threat to democracy since it would tend to make officials and legislators less subject to the wishes and opinions of those whom they are elected to represent.

Extralegal Devices in Government

Throughout the history of our national government, and followed in pattern by governments at lower levels, there has been a continuous accumulation of extralegal devices, or legalized devices which are in effect ways of evading Constitutional limitations. Such devices have grown as changing conditions have made them seem necessary; and some, having outlived their apparent usefulness, nevertheless persist because they have become traditional.

Legislative Committees. One of the more important of the extralegal devices has been the development of legislative committees which carry on most of the work of state and national legislative bodies, and even provide means for evading the constitutional division of powers and checks and balances. It has been estimated that 90 per cent of the work of the Congress is done by committees; and, except in extraordinary cases, the fate of proposed legislation lies principally in the committees to which the measure is assigned for deliberation and recommendation.

When a bill is introduced into either house of the Congress, it is immediately assigned to one of the standing committees, the discretion as to just which committee residing in the presiding officer. Thus he can influence the fate of the proposed legislation, if he so desires, by assigning it to one or another committee which he expects will be either favorably or unfavorably inclined toward it. The chairman of the committee, as a rule, has considerable control over the measure from that point, being able to hasten or indefinitely postpone its consideration by the committee. The committee, when it does consider the measure, may hold open hearings upon it or consider it in closed meetings. The committee is made up of members of the two major parties and thus brings to bear on each measure the viewpoints and interests of the party organizations. In committee the bill may be approved as it is presented, but more often it is amended or completely rewritten.

When the committee has completed its work on the measure it usually reports it back to the legislative house to which it is attached with its recommendation that the bill be passed, an unfavorable recommendation, or no recommendation. Since each committee is dominated by the same party which has a majority of votes in the legislative chamber, in most cases the committee recommendation is followed with little or no critical examination and debate.

The importance of a legislator is to be judged in most instances by the committee memberships and chairmanships the legislator holds rather than by his ability as a debater. It is in committees and party caucuses that he is best able to serve his constituency and his party, as

well as to promote his own policies and ideas. Frequent absence from the formal sessions of the legislative body may well mean that he is busy at more effective functions in committee meetings and caucuses and really influencing the course of legislation to a far greater extent than members who are frequently present at the formal sessions, but relatively ineffective in shaping the course of legislation.

The legislative committee is a means by which the legislative branch may break through the division of powers which would prohibit it from performing judicial and executive functions. In its committees the legislative branch may bring strong pressure to bear on various executives and administrators to influence their policies and activities. Pressure from committee hearings may reach even to the President through critical examination of his administration, usually by hearings conducted into the affairs of one or more of the major departments or independent agencies of government.

The legislative committee also has acquired through precedent certain judicial powers. It may bring charges against officials, call witnesses, and punish persons for failing to appear or refusing to testify. A not inconsiderable quasi-judicial power lies in the publicity which may attend a congressional hearing, and which skillful manipulation on the part of the committee, its chairman, or its appointed prosecutor may turn to serve the purpose of bringing strong public pressure to bear in favor of or against individuals and organizations.

Other Devices. Despite the original intent of the framers of the Constitution to leave a great part of the governing power in the various state governments, numerous devices, legal and extralegal, have developed to meet the constantly growing need for a strong central government. An example is the use of the Federal grant-in-aid to influence and control activities of state governments. As the country has grown and geographical distances have shrunk, the problem of lack of uniformity in laws and administrative practices in the various states has become a major one.

Among the devices by which the Federal government has increasingly extended its control to state governmental affairs has been the practice of appropriating, from the Federal treasury, funds which may be given to the states for specified purposes, on condition that each state meet Federal conditions in administering the funds. No state government can effectively hold out against the opportunity of getting its share of such Federal funds, especially if other states are accepting them. Thus, almost invariably the states accept the money and the requirements that go with them, which usually include the passage of laws that meet Fed-

eral approval and the setting up of administrative organizations to expend the grant which meet with Federal standards.

In such various fields as road building, rural education, public health, and social security the Federal government has been able in this way to largely centralize control in areas which were once considered as reserved to state or local control.

Summary

The actual operation of a democratic government depends, not so much on the formally constituted forms of government, as upon a variety of extralegal practices and devices which serve to bring about interest and activity on the part of people, and to effect the compromises which must be made among a wide variety of special interests such as are found in modern societies. These extralegal functions are performed by politicians and political organizations which serve a necessary and useful function, even though they are often guilty of abuses and corruption.

The most important of the political devices necessary to make governments function is the political party. Governments may have behind them numerous political parties able to influence governmental policies and practices, two major parties as in the United States, or a single party with all organized opposition suppressed, which is the distinguishing mark of totalitarian dictatorship.

The political party, especially in our system, is a working compromise arrangement among a large number of interests more or less effectively organized for their own purposes, and the success of a party in winning elections depends upon how well it can bring a large number of interest groups into a working arrangement for a sufficient time to gain a victory at the polls.

The winning of an election is only one outstanding phase of the competition among differing interests, for between elections there is the constant working of pressure groups of every conceivable nature to influence legislation and administration. Many pressure groups are well organized, either temporarily or permanently, and employ expert lobbyists in national and state capitals to watch out for their interests at all times.

Within government itself there have grown up extralegal devices to meet new conditions as they have arisen. An example is the development of the committee system in legislative bodies to the point where committees do nearly all of the work of legislation in addition to performing some administrative and judicial functions. Other devices within government, such as the use of grants-in-aid, have been developed

to centralize control despite the Federal form of government written into the Constitution, which provided division of power between central and state governments.

Terms

Extralegal
Politics
Multiple-party system
Coalition
Professional politician
Ward
Precinct
Merit system
Patronage
Protection
Graft
Lobby
Caucus
Constituency
Grant-in-aid
Pressure group

Questions

1. What useful purposes does politics serve in a democracy?
2. What is the most characteristic aspect of totalitarian dictatorships?
3. How do multiple-party and two-party systems differ in operation?
4. Why have successful third party movements been rare in American politics?
5. What are the devices used by pressure groups?
6. What is the importance of legislative committees?

READING LIST

The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1931.
Kenneth G. Crawford, *The Pressure Boys.* Messner, 1939.
H. F. Goshell and N. N. Gill, "An Analysis of the 1932 Presidential Vote in Chicago," *American Political Science Review,* Vol. XXIX, December 1935, pp. 967-984.
E. S. Griffith, "The Changing Pattern of Public Policy Formation," *American Political Science Review,* Vol. XXXVIII, December, 1944, pp. 445-459.
H. D. Lasswell, *Politics: Who Gets What, When, and How.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.
C. E. Merriam, *Political Power.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1934.
Peter Odegaard, *Pressure Politics: The Story of the Anti-Saloon League.* Harper & Bros., 1928.
R. V. Peel and J. S. Roucek, *Introduction to Politics.* T. Y. Crowell Co., 1941.
S. M. Rosen, *Political Pressures.* Harper & Bros., 1935.
J. T. Salter, *Boss Rule: Portraits in City Politics.* Whittlesey House, 1935.
———, *The American Politician.* University of North Carolina Press, 1938.

CHAPTER XVIII

Public Opinion and Propaganda

The principal means by which order and stability are maintained in societies is public opinion, or the surface agreement of most people upon the rightness or wrongness of particular modes of behavior, thought, and feeling. Public opinion may be distinguished from "private" opinion in that it is or may be published, that is, declared openly, whereas "private" opinion is often unexpressed or communicated only to a few of one's close associates. There is no necessary agreement between opinions privately held and those openly expressed by a group on a given matter or in a particular situation. Public opinion which is expressed may or may not be majority opinion, but at least it is not openly challenged by a majority.

Expressed public opinion is a force of great importance in organized group life, for upon it may depend the rise and fall of governments and administrations, the success or failure of particular kinds of business enterprise, the stability of institutions such as marriage or private property, and the obedience and respect of children for their elders. Because it is such a vital force in so many areas of life, the competition for its control is keen; and in such competition propaganda is used often with great skill, to sway public opinion one way or another. Especially in recent years has the importance of understanding public opinion and propaganda come to the fore in social sciences, and much study and speculation have entered into this effort.

The Nature of Public Opinion

In any consideration of public opinion it is well to guard against the semi-mystical notions that look upon the public as a personified group, having its existence apart from the individuals who make it up, and possessed of a "group mind" which is somehow distinct from and above individual minds. This precaution is necessary because much that has been written has been in this vein and has led to unrealistic ideas and conclusions about public opinion. It is true that the opinions which groups express publicly are not individual inventions, but rather part

of the group heritage; but the mechanics of that inheritance is that of inter-personal communication and is in no way superhuman.

Latent Public Opinion. There may be presumed to exist in any group a considerable area of agreement upon what is right and proper in the realm of human relations and behavior that is not openly expressed, but simply taken for granted. This general agreement is that in which the institutional values and mores lie. It may be presumed in our own culture that almost everyone is in agreement that to kill a person in cold blood, except in time of war, is wrong, but few people or groups feel it necessary to go about expressing such an opinion. It is simply the only conceivable opinion that, in our culture, any considerable group could express if called upon to judge such behavior.

This unexpressed but taken-for-granted agreement is latent public opinion. Although latent, it is still a basic force in every culture group and the foundation of all effective social control. In individual experience it is usually referred to as conscience, a deep-seated feeling for right and wrong which leads to discomfort and personal unadjustment when one has acted or spoken in a way that would conflict with the standards which are implied.

Active Public Opinion. When public opinion is expressed as a general judgment on some action already taken or contemplated, it is as a result of a process in which first an issue is presented, calling for decision; then discussion takes place among members of a group who are aroused by the issue; and, finally, agreement is reached on what opinion it is proper for them to openly hold. Such a process is referred to as arousing public opinion, and it consists of bringing latent opinion into the open and applying it to a particular case.

The publics which give open expression to opinions vary in many characteristics. They may be large, including a considerable proportion of the population of a country or of several countries; or they may be quite small, limited to a single community or neighborhood, or one or several interest groups in a population or community. It is more realistic to speak of publics than of *the* public, as numerous students of publics have shown, because publics are numerous and variable in any considerable group.

It is the rule that, even when public opinion is being aroused, most of the people who make up the particular public are disinterested or uncertain in their ideas, so that the expression of opinion is that of relatively few of those who are presumably involved. It is misleading to confuse public opinion with majority opinion, because public opinion need not be the expression of a measurable majority to be effective as a

guide to group thought and action. It is seldom, for example, that a majority of qualified voters agree upon an issue in an election.

Competence of Public Opinion. The question of what issues publics may be competent to decide can be answered only when the specific public in question is described.[1] Very large publics, made up of people of various age groups and from many walks of life, are competent only to pass on problems which may be judged by what is common in their standards of right and wrong, which, in most cases of this kind, are very broad principles of morality. A public made up, however, of a more select group who share a specialized training may be competent to pass judgment upon details of professional ethics, or even upon the expediency of specific technical behavior, as would be the situation if the qualified physicians of a country were to pass judgment upon the rightness or wrongness of wide application of a new type of cure for a disease.

It is obvious that public opinion is much more easily aroused and brought into action in relatively homogeneous cultures where the training of members of the group regarding standards of conduct has been much the same than in heterogeneous groups where there may be wide diversities in such training. Often in the latter type of group it is necessary to substitute for effective public opinion a compromise of incompatible views which may not be the expressed opinion of any of the several groups involved, but is necessary if any working basis is to be determined. Here, as noted in Chapter XVII on "Invisible Government," the politician becomes indispensable as the person who specializes in bringing about such compromises.

The Media of Public Opinion

Media of communication are important in the process of bringing about aroused public opinion and in making that opinion known to those who will be affected by the decisions made. In small communities, word-of-mouth communication may be sufficient for presenting the issue, conducting discussion, and making known the agreements reached. In larger communities, and over larger areas, mechanical aids and extensions of word-of-mouth communication become necessary, and such media are numerous. They include newspapers, other periodicals, books, radio, motion pictures, telephone and telegraph, and even art.[2] So vital are the mechanical media for arousing and expressing public

[1] A somewhat different point of view is found in Walter Lippman, *Public Opinion*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

[2] D. Waples (ed.), *Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy*, University of Chicago Press, 1942.

opinion that their ownership and control are a matter of great general concern. The fact that in the United States and other advanced countries there has been a steady trend toward control of a large part of the media of communication in relatively few hands has been a cause of great concern, because presumably it gives these few persons undue influence both in creating and in expressing the opinions of publics.

In some countries control of mechanical media of communication is monopolized by the government, as is the case in the Soviet Union. This means that those already in control present to publics, not issues for discussion, but decisions which already have been made; and there is no channel through which the expressed opinions may be made known except as the governmental authorities choose to have them known.

The Press. Historically the press has been the principal medium for arousing and expressing public opinion in this and similar countries. At the present time the press has yielded considerable ground to competing media in this field, but it still remains significant. Its importance in the realm of public opinion was given expression in the Constitutional amendment adopted soon after the birth of this nation which prohibited the Federal government from interfering with the "freedom" of the press, a freedom which has been jealously guarded by periodical publishers since then. Although the personnel of the press have been keenly conscious of their importance in relation to the mobilization and expression of public opinion, that function has been largely subordinated to other considerations, notably the utility of the press in advertising goods and services for which it is necessary that each periodical maintain the largest possible circulation. Periodicals of the present time, with few exceptions, are so anxious to please various factions and interest groups that they take pains to present all sides of issues.[3]

There are thousands of newspapers and magazines in local or general circulation throughout the United States. In addition to presenting issues and suggesting the supporting arguments for various opinions regarding them, most periodicals open their columns, to some extent, to letters from their readers and to interviews with prominent persons regarding public questions. Since newspaper editorials usually reflect reader opinion as nearly as the periodicals can determine such opinion, they are quite often used as indexes to what public opinion is on any particular problem.

The Radio. The principal rival of the press in the formation and expression of public opinion is the radio, a relatively new medium of mass

[3] For a more complete analysis see Paul Walter, Jr., "The Press," Chapter XXV, in J. S. Roucek and Associates, *Social Control*, D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.

communication. The radio has some advantages over the press, especially in that it carries the human voice to hearers, and the voice may be a powerful aid in impressing ideas and arguments—at times more effective than the words that are said. The radio also lacks some of the attributes of the press, especially in making public opinion known, for very few persons can be brought to broadcasting studios and interviewed.

The radio, in its role of stimulator of public opinion, has patterned its approach as closely as possible after the traditional presentation of newspapers, with news broadcasts, news commentators, partisan addresses, and "round-table" discussions. There has been a tendency for control of radio to be taken over by newspapers, so that in many communities the two operate in close association with each other.

Other Mechanical Media. Of considerable potential importance for public opinion is the motion picture, which can present the images of persons and events as well as the sound of voices and the printed word. The motion picture makers have been reluctant, however, to develop the possibilities that are implicit in their medium for manipulating or giving expression to public opinion, finding it safer and more profitable to concentrate as nearly as they can in the purely entertainment field.

Many critics of the motion picture feel that its makers should use the medium more deliberately to bring to the attention of publics issues of the day and to try to influence expressed opinions regarding those issues. A few more or less experimental motion pictures of "social significance" have been made and exhibited—in some cases with wide audience appeal, in others with disappointing results as far as interest and response are concerned. It is quite probable that people generally prefer, as do the makers of motion pictures, to keep motion pictures devoted largely to amusement in which they may incidentally serve to reinforce the latent morality of the group.

Manipulation of Public Opinion

The public opinion process is not spontaneous, but requires some deliberate stimulation to get into motion. Someone must discover and define issues and present them with sufficient force to attract attention in a busy and preoccupied world. Someone must keep discussion alive, once the issue is presented, until such time as there is agreement on an openly avowed judgment. Someone then must see that the judgment which has been reached is given public expression.

There appear to be, at all times, a great many persons and organized groups willing and anxious to undertake one or more of these functions, so that the competition for public attention for various issues is always

keen and lively. In our culture group, and others like it, there are many who make a profession of arousing public opinions and who develop skills adapted to this task.

Leadership and Public Opinion. Those who are successful in the manipulation of public opinions become recognized as leaders. It is their function to present issues and to take active part in the discussion of such issues to the end of gaining wide agreement with their points of view relative to the issues. Such leaders may have no other occupation, as in the case of professional agitators; or they may be engaged in political, economic, or other pursuits to which their public leadership is only incidental.

The type of leader who dominates on any particular occasion is a function of the situation in which he operates. From this point of view it is useful and enlightening to classify leaders roughly as crisis leaders, competitive leaders, and institutional leaders, each representing a somewhat different situational response. Rarest, as far as publics are concerned, is the crisis leader who may be anyone who arises in an unforeseen emergency and gains widespread attention. Just who, or even what type of person a crisis leader may be is entirely unpredictable, and his leadership may consist of nothing more than suggesting a course of action or inaction when others are in doubt.

The competitive leader is the kind which we most usually associate with the term. He is a leader who must compete with others for the leadership position in situations which have been foreseen and often carefully planned. In a political campaign, at conventions, and in numerous other situations, prospective leaders rival with each other for the attention and control of groups. If one such competitor can gain strong support from public opinion his ascendancy is insured temporarily. Since the position of a competitive leader is never completely secure, he must use such a temporary advantage to further manipulate public opinion in his favor.

The most usual type of leadership in the public opinion process is found in the institutional leader—the person who, because of some institutional position or role, is accepted as a leader without the necessity of competing for ascendancy. School teachers and college professors, ministers and priests, officers in the armed forces and some public officials, and others too numerous to mention are examples of institutional leadership so long as they are acting strictly in their institutional roles. When they act outside those roles they may carry with them some prestige from their institutional positions, but they expose themselves to competition in which, often, they are at a considerable disadvantage.

"Followership." Necessary to understanding the role of leadership in connection with the public opinion process, although often overlooked, is the complementary "followership" which effective leadership implies. Just as leadership may be understood in terms of situations in which it arises, so may followership be explained, in part, at least, in terms of particular social circumstances. The crisis leader is possible because most of the persons in an emergency are prepared to accept any suggested solution which appears to offer a way out. Competitive leadership struggles come about in a situation in which people are prepared for and expect to enter into a competitive process, as, say, an election which has been well advertised in advance and for which there has been long preparation. The institutional leader can function because the people who are led have been trained to accept such leadership.

Without followers no leader is significant. The kind of followers who are available, their training, and their preparation for "followership" roles all enter as importantly into the leadership equation as do the type of leader and his preparation for his role. It is quite probable that many situations which are described as "lack of leadership" could more accurately be described as "lack of followership." This is especially significant in our culture where we train everyone for leadership, insofar as we deliberately train them for any roles in leadership situations, with the result that often members of groups are reluctant to follow anyone.

Propaganda. The various devices and techniques which leaders use to arouse and manipulate public opinions are referred to as propaganda. In a specialized sense of the term, propaganda has come to be used to express value judgments, variously and often indiscriminately, upon the techniques, the issues, the arguments, and the causes that are presented to the public. In social science usage, propaganda is a neutral term, convenient for generalizing a number of well-known practices of those who manipulate public opinions.[4]

All such techniques have their beginning in a shrewd understanding of latent public opinion, or those notions which may be presumed to be widely held, though unexpressed, by the public to be reached. Issues are then defined in such ways as to suggest the judgment which those latent ideas *must* dictate in the particular question at issue. The stereotype, value-weighted words and expressions, selection of supporting facts or supposed facts, and slogans or catch-phrases which give ready expression to judgments are all a part of the repertoire of the skilled propagandist.

[4] R. T. LaPiere, "Propaganda and Education," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. XX, 1935, pp. 18-26; Edward L. Bernays, "Manipulating Public Opinions, the Why and How," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXXIII, 1928, pp. 958-971.

The development and standardization of propaganda techniques were greatly enhanced during the two world wars when efforts were made to sway entire nations to think and act in desired ways by both sides in the conflicts. The problem of developing desired public opinions was greatly complicated by the necessity of appealing across culture lines, because the residue of latent opinion varies from culture to culture, depending upon its particular moral heritage. These very difficulties led to the careful study of techniques and their relative effectiveness, resulting in the common store of highly skilled devices now available to all propagandists who study their art.[5]

In wartime, and in some countries even in periods of peace, censorship becomes a companion device with active propaganda. Censorship, while serving other purposes, may be used to keep issues from becoming known to publics and of preventing wide discussion or the expression of judgments. Usually such censorship is official and enforced by government to some extent, but it is also largely voluntary upon the part of those who control or have access to the mechanical media of communication, and even on the part of large numbers of persons in their ordinary conversation. Whether enforced or voluntary, it becomes understood that some events and matters are not to be openly stated or discussed under pain of being disloyal to one's nation in its hour of peril. Thus censorship may affect public opinion by preventing it from being aroused concerning some possible issues.[6]

Pressure Groups and Propaganda. In peacetime we most usually associate the systematic use of propaganda with pressure groups, and especially those engaged in attempting to influence governmental actions of one kind or another. These pressure groups were discussed in a previous chapter and are here of interest primarily because they have been the heirs to the increased knowledge and skill of propaganda practices which have come out of our war experiences. They have access, usually, to the media of mass communication and employ experts in the manipulation of public opinion to present their cases. Thus the American publics, like those of similar countries, may be said to be under a constant and bewildering bombardment of propaganda appeals through the press, radio, and other media, the great bulk of the systematic propaganda emanating from well-organized pressure groups. Often the origin of the propaganda appeals is concealed or vague, and the purpose behind them is nebulous as far as the publics are concerned. Indeed, one of the

[5] Harold Lavine and James Wechsler, *War Propaganda and the U. S.*, Yale University Press, 1940.

[6] For further analysis see J. E. Foster, "Censorship as a Medium of Propaganda," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. XXII, 1937, pp. 57-63.

usual practices of the propagandist is to conceal both the identity of the interest being served and the motive for efforts to sway public opinions.[7]

Immunity to Propaganda. The increasing skill of propagandists and the multiplication of media through which they may make their appeals are offset by constantly growing immunity of publics to propaganda. This immunity is a result of many causes. General rise in the level of education, while not in itself providing immunity, does put many people in a position to be much more critical of questionable or false appeals. More important is the specific increasing understanding by members of publics of the prevalence and tricks of propaganda, so that they are apt to maintain more critical attitudes toward any obvious appeals that are made to them. This factor, too, is easily exaggerated.

Quite probably the chief cause of growing immunity is simply a reaction to the tremendous amount of propaganda that is constantly impinging upon people's consciousness from every conceivable quarter. They simply get tired of it, and learn to ignore it as a person who must sleep in a noisy place learns to ignore the noise. There appears to be a saturation point in appeals to public opinion beyond which diminishing returns set in rapidly. Because most modern peoples have reached that saturation point, even despite the newer and better skills and media, propaganda does not increase in effectiveness proportionately with them. One reason that dictators have been much more successful in the use of propaganda than have others is that through tight control of the media of communication they can keep appeals to public opinion below the saturation point.

Public Opinion and Government

All effective and lasting governments depend upon the support of public opinion. This is as true of totalitarian government with their dictatorships as it is of democracies. Every dictator uses much of his power to insure a favorable public opinion. Totalitarian governments resort to balloting and other devices of democracy to insure continuous support from publics.

It is in democracies that public opinion has come in for the greatest study and comment. In a sense, democracy is government by public opinion; the difference in democracies being that the public opinion process is relatively free, and opposition leaders are permitted and encouraged to make their appeals. In democratic forms of government

[7] H. I. Childs, "Pressure Groups and Propaganda," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. CLXXIX, 1935, pp. 1-239.

there are well-established institutional methods of obtaining public opinion at frequent intervals, and presumably the public judgments thus expressed are eventually enacted into governmental policies. Admittedly the formal means by which democratic governments ascertain public opinion are crude, complex, and usually indirect, so that results are as often as not ambiguous. The informal skills of professional politicians are probably much more effective both in determining public opinions and in getting them realized in governmental practice whether through legal or extralegal channels.

Public Opinion Measurement. In recent years there has been rapid development and widespread use of relatively scientific measurement of public opinions by disinterested agencies which specialize in this task.[8]

The methods of the polls vary in details, but are based upon the general principle of sampling the various publics in a large population for expressions of opinions on a given issue.

Occasionally public opinion polls have failed markedly to give reliable indications of how people will vote, but their entire record shows that in most cases they are accurate indexes with considerable short-range predictive value; and with constant improvement of their techniques they should develop even greater reliability in the future. They are usually watched closely by public officials and politicians who are under constant necessity of keeping close touch with popular sentiments.

Such polling devices have advantages over the slower and more cumbersome official methods of determining public opinion in that they are much more direct expressions and involve less delay. Usually, too, the issues are much more clearly presented.

Public Opinion in Other Fields. Although public opinion is most usually discussed and thought of in connection with government and politics, it plays an important part in other fields of group activity. As noted in Chapter XIV on "Labor Problems," public opinion may determine the outcome of labor disputes. Every business is to some extent concerned with public opinion, because it may vitally affect the success or failure of the enterprise. Every person of prominence must constantly concern himself with public relations; and a lucrative occupational field has opened up for experts in the management of such relations, which involves successful manipulation of public opinion.

Least spectacular is the concern that every individual must have for public opinion as it may affect his everyday activities. This is felt most clearly and acutely by most persons in time of war, when to fail to

[8] Anonymous, "Gallup and *Fortune* Polls," *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Vol. IV, 1940, pp. 533-553 and 704-718.

behave in an obviously patriotic manner may bring dire consequences from an aroused public, whether it be simply in one's neighborhood or community, or in much wider publics in the case of supposed profiteering or other practices that gain wide publicity.

All of us become acutely aware of the force of public opinion in such abnormal times as those of war; but in other times as well, probably without so recognizing it, we are sensitive to actual or possible public approval or disapproval of our conduct or expressions. Most of us keep a constant curb on our public conduct and expressions for this reason, even though we may not think of such self-restraint in terms of public opinion.

In any neighborhood at any time, in offices or workshops, in clubs and other gatherings, the process of public opinion may be seen at work: the issues raised, the discussion, the application of generally accepted moral notions, and the general agreement on expressed opinion. Most gossip is a part of the process of public opinion, and quite often the neighborhood busybody is as skilled a propagandist as is the highly paid radio speaker.

Summary

The basis of order and stability in group life is general agreement among members of culture groups as to what is right and what is wrong. Usually such agreement is taken for granted, is unexpressed, and constitutes latent public opinion. When the group is called upon to pass judgment on an issue to which latent group opinions may be applied, through a process of discussion, the members, or some of them, may arrive at agreement as to what is the proper judgment to express, which is then active or aroused public opinion. Public opinion need not be majority opinion as long as its expression is not challenged by a majority; nor need it agree with the private opinions of those who make up the public.

Latent and aroused public opinion are both forces of great importance in controlling behavior and expressions of persons, and may shape governmental policies, aid business enterprises to succeed or cause them to fail, and otherwise may enter into all activities of organized group life.

Because of the obvious importance of public opinions, there is strong competition in efforts to manipulate it. The skills which have developed in this competition and which are used by those who attempt to control public opinions are described as propaganda. The efforts to win whole peoples to a way of thinking and acting in the two world wars have greatly increased the fund of knowledge and skills of propagandists. Except under dictatorial controls, however, publics have largely reached the saturation point where propaganda is concerned; and despite better

media and improved propaganda practices the arousing and manipulating of publics becomes more difficult.

Public opinion has been most studied and discussed in connection with government and political activities. All governments which remain in power must have the support of public opinion, whether they are dictatorships or democracies. Distinctive of democracies is that they have institutionalized ways of arousing and giving expression to public opinion, and they even encourage opposing points of view in the discussion of issues. Their formal methods, however, are admittedly clumsy and slow, and increasing reliance is placed in the unofficial measurement of public opinions by organizations which conduct "polls" on a somewhat scientific basis to measure public opinions on an issue at a given time.

Terms

Public
Latent public opinion
Aroused public opinion
Media
Crisis leader
Competitive leader
Institutional leader
"Followership"
Propaganda
Saturation point
Issue
"Poll"

Questions

1. How is public opinion related to order and stability in society?
2. What is the relationship between public opinion and private opinions of members of publics?
3. Need public opinion be majority opinion? Explain.
4. How have two world wars affected the development of propaganda techniques? Give illustrations.
5. What is the significance of immunity to propaganda? What is its probable cause?
6. What is the significance of the public opinion "poll"?

READING LIST

W. Albig, *Public Opinion,* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939.
F. C. Bartlett, *Political Propaganda.* The Macmillan Co., 1940.
Stuart Chase, *The Tyranny of Words.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1938.
H. L. Childs, *An Introduction to Public Opinion.* John Wiley & Sons, 1940.
Leonard W. Doob, *Propaganda: Its Psychology and Technique.* Henry Holt & Co., 1935.
P. F. Lazarfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet, *The People's Choice.* Chas. H. Duell, 1945.
Walter Lippman, *Public Opinion.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.
————, *The Phantom Public.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925.
Frederick E. Lumley, *The Propaganda Menace.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1933.
O. W. Riegel, *Mobilizing for Chaos: The Story of the New Propaganda.* Yale University Press, 1934.
A. J. Zuker, *Propaganda and Dictatorship.* Princeton University Press, 1936.

CHAPTER XIX

Ideologies and Mass Movements

The term "ideology" has come into wide usage in fairly recent times, even though the phenomenon it describes is as old as human history. The present interest in ideologies lies largely in their relationship to mass movements, so that the two may well be considered together as interrelated aspects of modern group life. There are struggles and conflicts among opposing ideologies and their supporting groups the world over, both as between nations, within nations, and cutting across national lines on a world-wide basis. Most people feel under compulsion to align themselves with one or more of the ideological movements of the time, and for many millions of people, apparently, such ideological identification has become the most important thing in life.

An ideology, as the term is usually used, is a system of logic based upon some premise which lies, often, beyond the realm of verifiable fact and at times, indeed, is contrary to scientific knowledge. The effectiveness of an ideology requires that people attach themselves to it as a matter of loyalty, which means that they accept it as a matter of faith and are precluded from critically analyzing it. These systems of logic and their underlying assumptions often are regarded as sacred by their adherents. When particular ideologies are subjected to critical thought by followers, various versions are apt to arise, and quite often the conflict between different interpretations of the same ideology may be more intense and bitter than that between supporters and opponents of the main logical construct, as has been clearly illustrated among the communists with their occasional internecine quarrels and resultant "purges."

Commonplace Ideologies

Most attention has been given to the more spectacular aspects of modern ideologies as they attach to economic and political affairs, but it is necessary to analyze some of the more commonplace examples if a clear understanding of their meaning is to be had. Many ideologies to which people become attached are not usually so labeled or recognized, but comparative studies of cultures have shown that they are universal

and that all cultures abound with them. They serve as the ready-at-hand justifications of all types of accustomed activity, purporting to explain such activities in rational or, at least, socially accepted terms. These explanations may be garbed as pseudoscientific, but are always much simpler than scientific explanations of the same phenomena would be, and less adequate to those who are critically inclined. Nevertheless, since they are a part of a person's culture he is apt to accept them, and often without serious question. There is an ideology to explain the brushing of teeth, one to explain why a man supports his dependents, and another to justify the requirement of regular school attendance on the part of children. With these we are all familiar, and most parents can readily explain in culturally accepted terms any of these requirements which are embedded in the folkways. There is even an ideology to explain why children and others should not question current and prevailing ideologies, its central thought being that life is complex enough without raising too many questions about why we do the things we do.

Universality of Ideologies. If we use the term "ideologies" in this broad sense, it is clear that they are universal and attached to every phase of group life.[1] Because they are designed to give ready-made answers to aspects of group activity which may come under question, they are most prominent in connection with types of behavior which are not taken for granted or completely accepted by the group. Thus phases of institutional activities which may seem to have outlived their social utility as life conditions change need a stouter ideological defense than do things which are simply taken as normal, natural, and a matter of course. There would be very little occasion for an ideology to justify man's standing erect or walking on his feet rather than all fours; no one questions such group ways. But such institutionalized behavior as wearing academic robes at a college commencement needs constant ideological justification since, in the view of many, it is an antiquated custom to be freely questioned and challenged.

The ideology as such is usually easier to recognize in most phases of living when we consider other cultures quite unlike our own, such as the primitive cultures of preliterate peoples.[2] If a Pueblo Indian is asked why his people perform elaborate dancing ceremonies, he has a ready cultural answer that may not appeal to outsiders as either logical

[1] Types of ideologies attached to various aspects of collective behavior, from the institutional and regimental to the congenial and revelous are described in R. T. LaPiere, *Collective Mehavior*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.

[2] Such primitive ideologies are discussed in L. Levy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality*, L. A. Clare, tr., The Macmillan Co., 1932.

or based upon sound premises and, therefore, is obviously ideological. Many of our own culturally accepted explanations of our activities may as obviously seem poorly founded if not ridiculous from the viewpoint of the Indian.

Within any cultural group, and especially such a heterogeneous one as our own, there are some ideologies that are accepted by practically everyone, and others whose acceptance is limited to segments of the general population. Each social class and each professional group [3] has its own system of premises and logic. There are regional ideologies, as well as those which purport to explain racial and ethnic group relations.[4]

In any realm where ideologies are found there is always the possibility of conflict among differing and opposing ideologies, as well as between various versions of one ideology. Such controversies become serious when they lead to mass movements, and bring about a division as between supporters of the *status quo,* in some regard, and those who are dissatisfied with things as they are. It is especially in the economic, political, and sociological realm that such conflicts are prominent at the present time, although at various historical periods the strife among religious or other ideologies has been the focus of attention.

Economic Ideologies

There are in Western Civilization—and influential even beyond its sphere—two dominant economic ideologies. Each is variously interpreted, but together they represent the basic conflict both between different peoples and within every national and cultural group. One of these was expounded by Adam Smith. At the time it was formulated by him it represented dissatisfaction with the *status quo,* but now it is considered a justification of existing schemes of economic arrangements in capitalistic countries. In opposition to this ideology is the other which is best known from the writings of Karl Marx. It has come to be regarded as the logical justification for attacks upon the *status quo* of capitalistic domination.

In this case the starting premise of the two opposed systems of thinking is the same—the acceptance of the proposition that economic activity is basic to all phases of group life, and that economic forces will prevail in the long run and in the best interest of all. The capitalistic ideology then proceeds to the further assumption that free enterprise capitalism is the natural and normal expression of economic forces. Therefore it is in the best interest of all people largely because it provides the

[3] For an example of a professional ideology, see Willard Waller, "Social Problems and the Mores," *American Sociological Review,* Vol. I, 1936, pp. 922-933.

[4] L. C. Copeland, "Racial Ideologies and the War," *Sociology and Social Research,* Vol. XXVII, 1943, pp. 441-446.

incentives which call forth efforts in individuals and lead them to make the sacrifices involved in saving. The Marxian logic pictures the capitalistic system as a man-made perversion of natural economic processes which has succeeded temporarily in delaying and thwarting the welfare of the masses. Thus, only the removal of the capitalistic system will permit the eventual realization by all of the benefits inherent in economic activity.

Various versions of these two fundamental ideologies are found at present under the labels of communism, socialism, fascism, capitalism, and a few other less prominent "isms." All of these specific systems of logic have numerous supporters and exponents, and each constitutes a challenge to the others. Quite generally communism is considered as a revolutionary doctrine and an attack upon the *status quo,* but in the Soviet Union, where it is the prevailing ideology, it is the staunch defense of things as they are there. Capitalism is generally regarded as the defense of the prevailing system, and various socialistic programs are considered as occupying various positions in the middle. Fascism is a less distinct economic ideology, containing some of the logic of capitalism and some of socialism, and generally subordinates purely economic considerations to the exaltation of the nationalistic state.

Ideologies within Capitalism. Within our own country, which most generally accepts the capitalistic explanation of economic organization and processes, we find differences in interpretations, even while there is agreement on the main theme. There are those who argue that any extension of state controls over economic activities constitutes a threat of socialism and will work for the ultimate economic disadvantage of the group; others have claimed that only by greater governmental regulation and economic participation can the capitalistic system be saved from its own abuses. The organized labor movement in this country has traditionally accepted the main logic of capitalism but has devised its own version which differs, usually, from the version upheld by employers. It is such differences in interpretation of a commonly accepted ideology that give rise to most of the economic controversies among the American people, who quite generally have refused to give loyalty to other ideologies such as communism and socialism.[5]

Political Ideologies

Three principal types of political ideologies enter into modern thinking importantly and command large followings. One was expounded by Thomas Hobbes to justify autocracy. It is based on the premise that

[5] Paul K. Crosser, *Ideologies and American Labor,* Oxford University Press, 1941.

man is inherently evil, and that human life, in its "natural" state, is "poor, solitary, nasty, brutish, and short." This being assumed, then any arrangement which freed man from his own natural degradation is to be welcomed; and such an arrangement can only come through government. Thus any government is better than none; and so important to human welfare is government that no one is justified in attacking or revolting against government.

Quite different, and in many ways conflicting, is the ideology expounded by J. J. Rousseau, who started with the assumption that only in his natural state can man really be free; and that, although government offers him theoretical advantages, it too often becomes the tool of a few to enslave the many. Under this system of thought, each person is not only justified, but is morally bound, to resist government where its dictates do not meet with the standards of one's own conscience.

Still another ideology is that found in the writings of John Locke, who emphasized that government is a contractual arrangement between the governed and their governors, and that, whenever the governors violate the conditions of that contract, the governed are justified in turning them out and replacing them by others who presumably will abide by the terms.

A more extreme form of the Hobbe's type of ideology is the version, set forth by the German philosopher Hegel, which glorifies the state as the instrument of a mystical national spirit. In this system of thinking, the individual can realize himself completely only by merging his own interests and destinies with those of the national spirit through the instrumentality of the state. This kind of ideology lends itself both to extreme nationalism and to the "leadership principle" as it is embodied in modern dictatorships.

An extreme version of the ideology propounded by Rousseau is that which is advanced by the anarchists, who reason that the state is an unnecessary evil and that man would be better off with no government.

American Partisan Ideologies. Americans generally accept the ideology of Locke as the explanation and justification of political organization and government—the idea that government is a contractual relationship freely entered between the governed and those who govern, and that this contract is subject to change at the will of the governed. But as in all nations where opposition is permitted to the existing government, there are opposing versions of the generally accepted ideology, and those are presumed to exist in the major political parties in this country. Although there have been fairly clear ideological differences between the major parties during various historical periods, it has become difficult in recent times to define such differences clearly. Insofar as ideological

versions are expressed in their party platforms, both major parties appear to be adhering to almost identical versions of the American creed. Such ideological differences as do exist in current American politics appear, rather, to cut across party lines, and divide the two between "conservative" and "liberal" elements in each party. Even in such a division it is difficult to find clearly marked differences in ideological versions.

Generally speaking the American people are less ideologically concerned in their political organization and thinking than are most European peoples. Their concern with such groups within the country as the socialists and communists is not so much an ideological conflict as it is a fear of subversion and trickery. It is characteristic of the American people, generally speaking, that they cannot look seriously upon any political ideology which is not in keeping with their accepted modes of thinking.

Other Ideological Conflicts

Especially as affecting our own culture group, there are other areas in which ideological differences and controversies abound, but in them the immediacy of the issues and the fervor of the adherents are usually not so great as in economic and political realms.

Sociological Ideologies. As affecting the general field of thought about human relations, sociological theorists have impressed two important sets of assumptions and logical systems on American thinking. The first is that which was given forcible expression by Herbert Spencer: the idea that societies evolve much as organisms evolve, and that the course of this evolution is a part of the general scheme of natural law. Man can do little to interfere with Nature's intentions, whether in the non-human or the human sphere; and indeed, in human affairs human intervention is most apt to be contrary to Nature's intentions, and therefore can only intensify human problems. Those who are modern society's unfortunates are such because they should be eliminated; and when people interfere to alleviate their lot, they are apt to help the unfit to survive to be greater burdens upon the fit. Thus all efforts of man to relieve the plight of the unfortunate are poorly conceived, unwise, and, in the long run, futile.

In strong opposition to such an ideology is the thought system forcibly expressed by Lester F. Ward, and embodied in his concept of teleology. In this ideology man differs from other living things in that he is endowed with intelligence; by the collective exercise of that intelligence he can guide his own destiny to the extent of eliminating major social problems and greatly improving the general lot. This telic ideol-

ogy became elaborated in American thinking into the notion of social engineering—that is, the guidance of society along scientific and rational paths by committees of experts.

Both these ideologies have been variously interpreted, and both, to some extent may be found in American thinking at the present time. Generally speaking, the growth and development of social work and the various social reform movements have had their basis in the telic ideology; and the opposition to such developments has been rooted in versions of the more deterministic thinking of Spencer.

Racial Ideologies. More specific in their application to human relations have been the various racial ideologies—notably those which are basic to racism, and opposed systems of logic which emphasize human equality. Most notable among the racial ideologies has been the one made articulate by Count de Gobineau which has become known to its opponents as the "Aryan myth." The basic notions of de Gobineau's logical construct are that racial mixture inevitably deteriorates human beings; that there is only one pure race—the "Aryan" race; that the Aryan race is destined, because of its purity—and therefore its inherent superiority—to rule humanity for humanity's own good. The Aryan myth has been, and is, used in various parts of the world, especially to justify "white supremacy" over colored racial groups. In this country it is especially entrenched in the South, but it is by no means confined to any area.

In opposition to the "Aryan myth" is the ideology based upon the assumption that all races are equal, potentially, and that what differences are found among them reflect largely cultural differences and contrasting opportunities and incentives.

Scientific, Religious, and Humanistic Ideologies. Other types of logical structure of some current concern, and presenting points of controversy and occasional conflict, are those which support science as an approach to understanding, the general ideology of religion, and the intermediate ideology of humanism.

The scientific ideology assumes that observed and verifiable fact is the only safe guide to understanding, whether in the human or other realms. This ideology has gained great prestige through the "triumphs" of physical and natural sciences, and especially through the highly successful technologies which have made applications of the findings of science. In extreme form, the scientific ideology would rule out all types of supposed knowledge not based in scientific observation. Thus it conflicts with both religion and humanism, which place emphasis upon "intuitive" understanding.

Religious ideology, in a general sense, emphasizes the limited abilities of man to understand himself or his world, except through revelation coming from superhuman sources. Truth, in this logical construct, is Divinely revealed, and not the product of man's own efforts. Humanists place their ideological emphasis upon man himself as the interpreter and discoverer of Truth, but by other than the rational methods of scientific observation, experiment, and verification.

Mass Movements

Ideologies become of concern to students of social problems when mass movements arise around them, as they frequently do.[6] Such movements may be of several types: relatively spontaneous and short-lived, and often violent; more deliberate and longer-lived fanatical movements; and organized revolutions. Such movements are distinguished by leadership, which becomes symbolic of the ideological basis of the movements, and by the extreme loyalty of followers to the ideology.

Spontaneous Movements. The spontaneous movements are typified by lynching mobs and riots, in which a considerable number of people are motivated to protest against some real or fancied grievance. The participants may be a score of people, or they may include thousands, usually depending upon the duration of the movement. Such movements tend to spread over larger areas and take in more people until they have run their course and normal behavior has been restored.

Basic to such movements is the condition of discontent shared by considerable numbers, who develop the notion that some other person or group is responsible for their ills. This discontent may exist in extreme form over a long period of time without leading to a mass movement. When it is present, however, any dramatic event which focuses attention may be sufficient to precipitate violent action. Where such movements are recurring, as in the case of lynching in some of the southern states, the ideology is uniform and is usually sufficient to justify the actions of the group to themselves and to their sympathizers, if not to the more general public.

Leadership may devolve upon anyone who makes a concrete suggestion as to a course of action or who takes the first step in a course of action, the pattern of which is already familiar to the group—often the case with lynching mobs.

Fanatical Movements. Usually longer in duration, sometimes persisting through generations, are movements of a fanatical nature, whether vio-

[6] Paul Meadows, "An Analysis of Social Movements," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. XXVII, 1943, pp. 223-228.

lent or nonviolent. Such movements occur at intervals among all peoples and have at their core a fairly elaborate ideology, often religious, but occasionally economic, political, or otherwise. Typical of fanatical movements is charismatic leadership, in which a leader, whether mythical or real, becomes so closely identified with the ideology that loyalty is transferred largely from the ideology to the person.[7]

Most religions, and many of the cults in all religions, had their beginnings as such fanatical movements. In our own recent history, several economically motivated fanatical movements came into prominence during the depression years of the 1930's, including the Townsend movement, and the EPIC (End Poverty in California). Fanatical movements whose ideologies are primarily political are more frequent in the recent histories of other countries than our own and have occasionally gained wide followings for particular leaders.

The leadership of such movements is called Messianic or charismatic leadership, because of the tendency of the group to clothe the leader in mystical attributes and to ascribe to him superhuman powers to lead them out of their troubles. The ideologies of such movements are usually looked upon as superhuman in origin, and as sacred or quasi-sacred creeds.

Revolution. The largest and most disrupting socially of mass movements are revolutions. Most large-scale revolutions are complicated social phenomena, which include calculated political strategies as well as a more fanatical element, but usually their core lies in an extremist mass movement motivated by charismatic leadership which has become symbolic of a political ideology justifying, or even making imperative, the overthrow of the existing system of government and the substitution of some other form.

Famous among the revolutions in our own culture history are the French and American revolutions. Although the ideologies which were the rallying points for most of those who participated in them are commonplace to our thinking now, at the time they were first propounded they were generally considered radical and fanatical; and the leaders, now known through the colder light of history, in many cases were surrounded with a charismatic aura at the time they were active.

The long succession of violent revolutions in Mexico illustrate these typical mass-movement characteristics, as did the more recent revolution which overthrew and displaced the Czarist government of Russia. In the latter case, Lenin and Stalin (and for some, Trotski) are still considered as Messianic leaders with superhuman attributes.

---

[7] Sigmund Neumann, "The Results of the Demagogue," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. III, 1938, pp. 487-498.

Loyalty to Ideologies. Mass movements clearly illustrate what is generally true of ideologies and their followers. The bond attaching the followers to the ideologies is one of loyalty, and often of blind loyalty, which makes it practically impossible for them to be critical of the ideologies. Usually the most loyal adherents to ideologies have no adequate or accurate knowledge of their content beyond what is conveyed in a few catchwords and slogans, but these are sufficient to bind them and incite them, often, to sacrifice and strenuous or dangerous action. "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" was a rallying cry during the violent periods of the French revolution for many thousands who had little further knowledge of the elaborate logical justifications which their intellectuals had developed for their actions. "White supremacy" suffices to incite many people to violence, even though they have no understanding of the intricate theories of racial differences which their intellectual leaders have constructed.

Dramatization of Ideologies. Those ideologies which appeal to wide followings usually become dramatized in myths and legends which present in simplified form, easily grasped, the general argument of the ideology. In such stories the supposed virtues which are logically presented in the original theory are personified and become in effect, heroes, with whom the followers may identify themselves. The impact of the ideology in this form is greatly increased if there is also a personified "villain" who unsuccessfully attempts to thwart the hero in his efforts to achieve his desired and deserved goal.

Familiar to us is the dramatization of our own economic and political ideologies. The typical "success story" carries for many the principal arguments of our economic ideology better than can textbooks and treatises in economic theory; and the story of the rise of the poor boy to the Presidency is an efficient vehicle for our political ideology. Most religions which have large followings abound in simple dramatic stories of the eventual triumph of good over evil, with both good and evil personified.

Summary

Ideologies, or logical justifications for given ways of thinking and acting, are universal and commonplace. They are developed around every customary activity of a people and serve the purpose, presumably, of answering questions as to why particular things are done, or should be done, in a particular way instead of in other ways. The term "ideology" has come into wide usage in recent years mainly in connection with

the more elaborate theories which are widely current regarding what constitutes the proper economic or political system; and in these fields ideologies are now the center of world-wide as well as localized conflict.

Ideologies become of concern to students of social problems when they lead to mass movements of people who attach their loyalties to them and act in accordance with them. Such mass movements may be short-lived and limited in scope, or larger and persisting. In extreme cases they become revolutions aimed at the overthrow of a given governmental system and its replacement by another system.

The tie of loyalty by which people become attached to an ideology usually precludes them from critically analyzing the logic of it; and in many cases such critical examination is considered as a sacrilege. In the case of ideologies that gain a wide following, the more sophisticated logic is supplemented by slogans and phrases which, for most followers, come to stand for the ideologies and command loyalty, even though the supporters have little knowledge of the broader theories which their intellectuals have evolved. A usual devise to gain and hold wide support for ideologies is to dramatize them in simple form, usually personifying the virtues advocated by the ideology as a hero with whom followers may identify themselves in imagination.

Terms

Assumption
Logical construct
Premise
Subversion
Teleology
Humanistic
Mass movement
Charismatic
Messianic
Fanatical
Cult
Slogan
Incite
Symbolic

Questions

1. Why is it usually easier to recognize the ideologies of other culture groups as such than to recognize those of our own culture?
2. What is the relation of ideologies to the *status quo?*
3. Why is it important to recognize the element of loyalty in studying ideological movements?
4. How do leaders enter importantly into mass movements?
5. Explain the tendency to dramatize elaborate ideologies.
6. Are ideological explanations likely to be scientifically valid? Explain.

READING LIST

Franz Alexander, *Our Age of Unreason.* J. B. Lippincott Co., 1942.
Hadley Cantril, *The Psychology of Social Movements.* John Wiley & Sons, 1941.
E. Hermann, *History of Economic Doctrines.* Oxford University Press, 1945.
R. T. LaPiere, *Collective Behavior.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.

Alexander H. Leighton, *The Governing of Men.* Princeton University Press, 1945. Chapter XVII.

Max Lerner, *Ideas Are Weapons.* Viking Press, 1937.

H. Lundholm, *The Psychology of Belief.* Duke University Press, 1936.

R. M. MacIver, *The Web of Government.* The Macmillan Co., 1947.

Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia,* L. Wirth and E. Shils, tr. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936.

Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias.* P. Smith Co., 1941.

CHAPTER XX

Problems of Education

All of the important attributes of social problems that have been discussed in other connections in this book may be found in an examination of the problems of formal education—the strain between the need for changes and opposition to change, confusion and inconsistency of ideals, ambivalence of attitudes, inter- as well as intragroup discrimination, and close interrelationship with other problems of modern societies. If we think principally of the problems of education in our own cultural setting, one of the most obvious sources of disagreement and corresponding maladjustments arises from the ambivalence of attitude implicit in our generalized cultural orientations. The American people traditionally place a high cultural value upon education, so much so that it might be considered typical of us as a people that we venerate education. It is interesting that, at the same time, we are highly suspicious and even contemptuous of the educative process. Our great cultural respect is for education in the abstract, and our antagonisms and criticisms are leveled at the concrete manifestations of education as they actually touch us—the teachers, teaching methods, school systems, curricula, and articulate "book learning."

As a result of the extremely high esteem in which we hold education in the abstract we place upon our school systems impossible tasks and expect impossible results. We fully expect educational systems to furnish panaceas for all social problems from those of juvenile behavior to divorce; to produce uniformly good citizens who shall nevertheless be open-minded and highly individualistic; and to mark certain pathways to economic success and security for all. In our cultural evaluation of education, we have a naive faith that it will somehow accomplish what all other institutions of our societies could not.[1]

At the same time that we place upon education such tremendous responsibilities and tasks, we are highly critical of our educational institutions and their personnel, to the extent of placing innumerable obstacles in their way at every turn. It is in keeping with American democratic tradition to believe that most of our formal education is

[1] Harold F. Clark, "Can the Schools Remake the World?" *School and Society*, Vol. XLIV, 1936, pp. 497-501.

quite irrelevant to "real life," and that educated persons represent a kind of undemocratic snobbery. Teachers and professors are at a disadvantage in comparisons with the "men of action," as reflected in the oft-repeated maxim, "Those who can, do; those who can't, teach." [2] The pupils who are the raw material for the educators gain their attitudes chiefly from the community, which, in turn, may present obstacles to schools in efforts to do a reasonably effective job.[3]

Universality of Education

From anthropologists we learn that systematic education is a part of the cultural process of every group of people, even though the type of educational institution may vary widely from one culture to another. Among most primitives, education is principally a function of familial and religious institutions, as it was early in the cultural development of our own group. The free public school, coeducation, and compulsory school attendance which are so much a part of our own ideas of education at the present time are quite recent developments, relatively; and the specialized "school" to transmit education to the young appears to have been a by-product of the development of written language.

In comparative studies of culture groups we still find wide variety in educational practices and ideas. In primitive groups, formal education, if it exists at all outside the familial and religious organizations, is limited to a very few persons whose responsibility it is to preserve and guard the traditions of the group. In fact, it is in such comparative studies of education that we can clearly see that traditionally it has been mainly a devise for passing on from generation to generation, as nearly intact as possible, the accumulated knowledge, wisdom, and beliefs which have come down from the past. In this function, education is primarily conservative; and its influence is principally exerted to prevent rapid change in group-life activities and ways.

Historical Development

In the history of Western Civilization, ideas and institutions of education have become much more clearly defined. Schools have become separated from familial organization and highly specialized in function. As a later development they have even been separated, largely, from religious institutions and controls. Until recently, however, formal schooling has been limited to a select few, and whole groups, as girls

[2] A somewhat different interpretation is found in Warren C. Seyfert, "What the Public Thinks of Its Schools," *School Review*, Vol. XLVIII, 1940.

[3] Samuel Tanenbaum, "Uncontrolled Expressions of Children's Attitudes Toward School," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. XL, 1940, pp. 670-678.

and women, have been excluded from its benefits. The element of traditionalism has remained strong until recent times, and learning beyond command of the basic arts of reading and writing was highly authoritarian.

Influence of Science. The impact of science upon formal education has tended to shift emphasis from authority to experimentation, from the closed to the open mind, and led eventually to serious consideration of universal education as a means of promoting general progress. Coupled with the prestige of science, beginning a century and a half ago, was the highly unrealistic rationalism which presumed that the human being is an automatic fact-digesting machine; and that, by exposing everyone to a bombardment of assorted factual data, we would produce rational societies. This notion, despite accumulated evidence to the contrary, still governs a great deal of our educative process and thinking.[4]

American Influence. These developments in education belong largely to European backgrounds of our own educational theories and systems. The unique contributions of the American people have been largely in emphasis upon the political importance of education and upon education as an economic tool. The former can be summed up as the notion that democracy works best if it has an enlightened citizenship, and that the production of such a citizenship is the task of the school. The latter is the stress placed upon education for vocational proficiency as a principal justification for the time and energies which go into the process.

It is these notions which paved the way for universal and compulsory education, ideas which have spread widely and have gained almost universal acceptance in our own culture group.

Education and Political Science

There are few political theorists of our own culture who would question the proposition that education in the abstract somehow produces better citizens, and it is seldom questioned that the informed citizen is any different from the wise citizen. In the concrete manifestations of education, however, the ambivalence of attitude previously mentioned becomes apparent. The practical politician usually has no high regard for the learned professor and the "brain truster," and the "cult of the average man" (who is not a highly educated man) has a strong hold in our political thinking at any but the textbook level. Teachers are quite generally suspect of radicalism, as is evidenced by frequent public

[4] J. L. Bennett, *The Diffusion of Science*, John Hopkins University Press, 1942

criticisms and efforts to control what they teach, in the interest of "sound Americanism." [5]

Reflected in the contradictory attitudes toward education in the abstract and in its concrete manifestations lies a profound issue: To what extent shall education be factual and scientific, and to what extent shall it be indoctrination? [6]

The answer to such a question is difficult, and the more detailed the attempted application, the more difficult any answer becomes. The ideal of education for better citizenship implies indoctrination, often at the expense of scientific objectivity; and in application it often requires the suppression and distortion of facts. Even where agreement is reached that some indoctrination is unavoidable in education, there remain the questions of the objectives of indoctrination and the extent and detailed application of the editing of facts.

The problems of the political significance of education are aggravated by partisan politics and ideological divisions within the population. Educational content that might be wholly approved by one group might be as thoroughly disapproved by another. Even more difficulty is presented by the fact that each major political party is, at any time, an uneasy compromise among a number of varying interest-groups, each of which has its own notion of what indoctrination should take place in schools. For example, some interest groups feel strongly that certain religious beliefs are a part of our cultural heritage and should be taught in schools, whereas others feel as strongly that religion has no place in public schools.[7] This is only one of many such questions which constantly confront school administrators from the lowest grades of elementary schools to universities and colleges.

Centralized Control. The relation of government to education is a matter of some controversy. As a people, we are quite generally agreed that free public education is a responsibility of government and is justifiably supported by general taxation, but there is difference of opinion as to which levels of government should guide educational policies. Historically and traditionally education has been chiefly a function of local government, but there has been a consistent trend toward centralization at the state level. At present, legally, the control of education resides mainly in state governments, but extralegal controls have carried control to national levels. Even though state governments provide the

[5] Anonymous, "Loyalty Oath Laws for Teachers," *School and Society*, Vol. LIV, 1941, pp. 771-72.

[6] B. F. Pittinger, "Indoctrination for American Democracy," *School and Society*, Vol. LIII, 1941, p. 777; and criticism, Vol. LIV, 1942, p. 594.

[7] "Religious Instruction in School Time: a Symposium," *Frontiers of Democracy*, Vol. VII, 1940, pp. 72-77.

machinery through which educational activities are carried on and standards determined, they must recognize the standards established by "accrediting agencies," which are policy making bodies beyond state jurisdictions.

Increasingly thought has been given in recent years to greater participation of the Federal government in educational finances and policy, as represented in the movement for more funds from Federal sources for equalization purposes,[8] and a stronger educational agency in the national government. Strong opposition to greater participation of the Federal government in education comes from many who fear that such centralization might lead to results similar to those in other countries where the national government has succeeded in gaining almost complete control over education. Especially in the totalitarian dictatorships, central government control over education has been a powerful weapon of the governing clique in maintaining itself in power.

Educational Pressure Groups. One of the political and governmental aspects of education, notable especially at the state level in this country, is the organization of educators and other interested persons into strong pressure groups. The teacher organizations in each state have become powerful elements in politics and support strong lobbies at state legislatures. The fact that the educational organizations usually command wide public respect tends to add to their strength in affecting legislation and administrative policies of government, especially when such legislation has a direct bearing upon the schools.

National organizations of educators also maintain lobbies and are influential in guiding legislation and policies in the national government, but to a lesser extent than at the state level. The national organizations, armed with the powers of accrediting or withholding accredited standing as far as particular schools and school systems are concerned, bring their influence mainly to bear upon local school administration. Committees of national organizations which examine and investigate schools, whether public schools or colleges and universities, are highly respected by administrators and may set standards of organization and performance with the expectation that they will be widely adopted and closely followed.

The Economics of Education

From the standpoint of economics, the principal justification of the elaborate educational systems of modern countries lies in the preparation

[8] Advisory Committee on Educational Policies, *The Federal Government and Education,* Government Printing Office, 1938.

they give students to fit efficiently into the productive enterprise. Such a viewpoint strongly emphasizes the vocational and professional aspects of schooling, as well as the kinds of learning that equip students with the basic tools for all kinds of work—writing, reading, and arithmetic. In a culture scheme such as our own with its general economic orientation, this point of view is very apt to be the dominant one, and it keeps alive the controversy over how much of the formal education of a child should go into "practical" instruction, and how much into the "cultural."

Several important considerations enter into this problem. One is that, even though there is a consistent trend for more and more students to spend more years in school, the majority of students withdraw from school before they reach the college level, and considerable numbers drop out quite early in their educational course. If those who leave school at the various levels are to be equipped to take over occupations, such a consideration must enter into the school curriculum early, and continue to be important throughout the various school levels. At the higher levels of education, where professional or pre-professional training is offered, there is a tendency for narrow specialization and increased educational requirements for every occupational field. This tends to crowd out courses of study that are not strictly vocational or that do not contribute in "practical" ways to occupational training.

The education of children, especially if continued to higher levels, means a considerable financial burden for a large proportion of the parents and families of the children, even under our free public school system. Many parents accept the economic emphasis upon the practical in education and expect that their children will be equipped for better earning power. They tend to look with some suspicion upon courses which seem to have no direct bearing upon earning capacity.

At the same time there has been an opposing trend to introduce into education at all levels courses to fit children for aspects of living other than the purely occupational. In larger school systems and in colleges and universities, there are more and more courses designed for such a wide variety of purposes as helping them to make a marriage adjustment, to observe the rudiments of personal hygiene, to drive an automobile safely, and even to excell in the art of fishing.

Auxiliary Enterprises. Of economic importance has been the development in educational institutions of a number of auxiliary enterprises involving considerable investments of school funds which must be offset by large-scale commercialization. The outstanding example, and most controverted, is in connection with the development of football, basketball, and other sports as extracurricular activities. Colleges and universities for many years have found themselves involved in highly competi-

tive and increasingly costly sports competitions which have led to the erection of large stadia and extensive promotional activities. In order to compete in such activities it has become necessary to devise means of subsidizing athletes; and the coaches and other functionaries involved in these sports have, in many cases, become the best paid and most esteemed members of the staffs of the institutions. The same trend has become a problem for many high schools.

Although football and other sports have been the most notable of such auxiliary enterprises, there are many others at various levels of education, and all present somewhat similar problems. Bands, orchestras, dramatics, and student publications are a few of the other activities of this type, all having a long tradition as extracurricular enterprises, but tending increasingly to become highly commercialized to the extent of involving considerable sums of money and of absorbing increasingly the attention and energies of students and of the administrative supervisors.

Labor Problems. The organization of educators into pressure groups has been noted in connection with the political aspects of education in this country. Closely related, but somewhat different in history and significance, is the more recent trend toward organizing teachers and other educators into labor unions for collective bargaining. Such unions have not become extensive, as yet, but are tending to grow and spread. They are usually affiliated with national labor organizations and thus bring to bear upon disputes some of the power and prestige of these larger organizations.

The strategy and tactics of such teacher organizations are borrowed largely from the labor movement. They have included the use of the strike as a means of forcing issues with employing officials and boards and have concentrated chiefly, but not entirely, upon gaining increases in wage scales and security of tenure. Such organizations, however, have espoused other causes, especially opposition to laws which they feel would limit the freedom of classroom teaching.

The strike has also been used with increasing frequency by students in high schools and colleges in efforts to force their views upon administrators. Frequently students have used strikes to support teachers whom they felt were being unjustly treated, but they have also been used both to support and oppose racial and ethnic segregation in schools.

Sociological Aspects

The use of pressure group techniques, labor organization, and similar devices to protect and promote the interests of educators, as well as the infiltration into education of dominantly economic considerations,

indicates that the school must operate as a part of the community, adopting community standards and techniques and reflecting community viewpoints. The integral place of the school in the community has long been recognized by students of education and has recently been the subject of much detailed investigation. Especially do these relationships impinge upon the school administrators and teachers as members of communities, even though they are usually considered a special type of community member not quite like others.[9] The relationship of educators in the community has been one of the principal concerns of the educational sociologist.

Such community relationships vary with communities and individuals. However there is uniformity in the relationship pattern in that the community most usually sets special standards of behavior to which educators are expected to conform, and which are somewhat different from the standards set for others in the community. The teacher's position in close contact with growing children, and therefore as a potential model for children, is the rationalization behind such differential expectations, which often are sources of irritation and misunderstanding between teachers and other members of the community.

In most communities there are constant problems of disciplinary measures used in schools and not approved by parents or the community, of curricular innovations, and of time spent in extracurricular activities. Some exceptional administrators and teachers have been able to attain positions of leadership and influence in their communities, and the highest professional standards stress the importance of this; but for most teachers and administrators their community standing is represented by a good-natured tolerance if favorable, and extremely critical attitudes if unfavorable.

Social Control. More fundamental, from the sociological viewpoint, is the importance of the school in the general scheme of social control.[10] The problem reflects the basic ambivalence of the American attitude toward education discussed earlier in this chapter. The child spends a large part of his time at school during the years when presumably he is developing habits and attitudes related to social control. Although the community is apt to distrust the concrete methods used by schools for training students and to pass this suspicion on to their children, they

[9] L. A. Cook, R. B. Almack, and F. Greenhoe, "Teacher and Community Relations," *American Sociological Review,* Vol. III, 1938, pp. 167-174; F. Greenhoe, "Community Contacts of Public School Teachers," *Elementary School Journal,* Vol. XL, 1940, pp. 195-204.

[10] This aspect is discussed by P. F. Valentine, "Education," Chapter IX, in Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, *Social Control,* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.

also look to the school to bring about miracles of character development. The community attitudes are shown in connection with such problems as that of juvenile delinquency, where often the tendency is to place a large part of responsibility upon the school.

In a broader sense, the school is only one of many educational agencies in the community, and as such must compete for influence over the child with the family, play groups, commercialized recreational agencies, the prevalent community attitudes, and the mass of reading material available to any child, ranging from the widely popular comic books to the flood of newspapers and other periodicals which are always accessible.

It is only in the light of the totality of these competing influences that the possibilities and limitations of the school in building attitudes and habits of conformity to group standards can be evaluated. As might be expected, school, and more especially particular teachers, may exert dominant influences upon some children; but for others they have little influence, and that often of a negative nature. The study of case histories of delinquent and pre-delinquent children shows the surprising uniformity with which school maladjustment, often truancy, is one of the earliest of the recognized symptoms; but further investigation usually shows that behind the school difficulties are less obvious maladjustments in the family and home.

Family Substitute. The study of the sociology of the family as a set of institutions shows clearly the trends toward more restricted functions and less efficiency in child raising. The urbanization of the rural family patterns has made necessary radical changes and has greatly aggravated the effects of disruptive influences found in town and city life. Modern parents, generally, are poorly equipped by training and experience for the exacting tasks of preparing children for adulthood.

As the family in our culture becomes less able to perform its traditional functions of preparing children for adulthood, the school has increasingly become a substitute for the family, and the teacher a substitute for the parent. Yet the great majority of teachers are as poorly prepared and as handicapped by other pressing considerations as the parents for whom they must substitute. Despite all of the ideological emphasis which has been placed upon individualization of treatment of school children, the task of the American school is one, mainly, of mass education, in which individualized treatment is usually a practical impossibility.

Increasingly the study of child psychology and development has been stressing the fundamental importance of pre-school years in character

and personality formation and the fact that basic patterns of behavior and thought are formed before the child reaches school. Those children whose earlier training has been favorable offer few problems to schools, whereas those children whose families have already failed to achieve discipline become the difficult children in school years. Such a rule is not invariable, but it does explain much of both the success and the failures of the schools as agencies of social control.

Aims of Education. From the political science point of view the purpose of the school is primarily to produce well-informed and right-thinking citizens; from the standpoint of the economist it is mainly to equip students to make a living; but the sociological notion of the function of schools is based on the realization that personalities cannot be thus fragmented, and social adjustment cannot be neatly compartmentalized into political adjustment, economic adjustment, etc. The emphasis of sociology and social psychology, insofar as they concern themselves with the formal educational process, is upon the basic organic unity both of society and the personality.

The purpose of formal education, thus approached, is to share with other institutions and institutional constellations the shaping of entire personalities, and the preparation for complete social adjustment. It recognizes that the person thoroughly and efficiently trained in a vocational skill may be an utter misfit as far as other phases of adjustment are concerned—adjustment to family, to community, to nation, and to community life generally; and that even a well-informed and right-thinking citizen may be a very ineffective person socially.

This view does not simplify, but greatly complicates the problem of education, especially in a culture setting like our own. Our culture, as has been noted repeatedly, is marked by rapid change and great diversity of traditions. The child in school today is being prepared to live as a mature adult in a largely unpredictable future by teachers whose training took place at some time in the past, so that the requirements for social adjustment are almost certain to be quite different from anything the teacher can conceive by the time the schooling is put to use. The student who is brought up in the reflected atmosphere of one community, with its particular set of traditions, may live out his life in quite different community settings, with contrasting standards and ideals. Especially in an era of great personal mobility, both social and spatial, the formative effects of formal schooling may misfit rather than fit the individual for adjustment.

Education of Women. The problems presented in the education for girls for womanhood present many special difficulties. Even though there is,

throughout the general coeducational system, the prevailing notion that preparation of girls for future adjustment is no different from the preparation of boys, it is necessary to make many minor modifications when this idea is applied. Since the general status of women is changing much more rapidly than that of men, it is even more difficult, in their case, to plan for their total adjustment in a future society.

At present, most women still become housewives, even though there is a rapid trend toward wider occupational and political participation. Our traditional ideals of womanhood are still closely bound with notions of motherhood and homemaking, despite recent and current changes; and, for the parents of girls, high school, and more especially college, is chiefly related to marriage opportunity. What further changes in the status and range of activity and opportunity of women will come about before the present generation of girls reaches maturity, neither parents nor educators can foresee. Some phases of the problem are reflected in the concern over the fact that educated girls and women are the least likely to marry; and, if they marry, they have no children or fewer children than do those with less schooling.

Social Work in Schools. Sociological attitudes toward schools are entering in a practical way into school administration with the increasing tendency to attach social workers to school systems, and, to some extent, in the increasing vogue of having trained counselors to help students meet present and future adjustment problems. The social worker first entered the school system as a visiting teacher to displace or supplement the truant officer, whose function was chiefly to see that children complied with compulsory school attendance laws. Such officers were constantly confronted with the fact that truant children often had difficult home and family problems which needed careful investigation and broader treatment than the simple police function implied.

The social worker in schools is largely concerned with the areas of conflict and maladjustment between home and school and, to a lesser extent, with conflicts between the community and schools. Increasingly, they have also become concerned with the adjustment problems of the teachers.

Educational Opportunity

Democratic ideals call for equality of opportunity; and, since education is regarded as the key to opportunity, there is the tendency always to criticize departures from the ideals which are found in our actual school systems. All students of education in this country note that there is wide diversity in the extent to which schooling that meets modern standards is accessible to different population groups.

There is a considerable difference between the educational opportunities available in rural and urban communities. The rural school, generally, is less well equipped in physical facilities and personnel than is the urban school and, because of its limited size, is usually less able to offer a varied curriculum to its students. Differences also exist as among the regions of the country, with some areas able to support much better schools, by accepted standards, than others. Similar differences may be found between particular schools, even in the same community, especially where a degree of segregation is practiced.

Even under a system of free public education, the children of the lower socio-economic classes do not have ready access to what are supposedly the best schools and colleges. Many students are still forced, by economic or similar considerations, to drop out of school early, even though they show promise in their school work. Inequalities are especially aggravated where racial and ethnic discriminations enter into them.

Many private and governmental agencies are occupied with efforts to correct, in part, at least, such inequalities, and in recent years courts have been more inclined than in the past to rule against discriminatory practices on the part of communities and school administrators.

General Trends. Throughout American history, and probably predictable into the foreseeable future, are a number of definite trends in American education. More children go to school; and they tend, increasingly, to attend for longer hours and more days of the year. They also tend to remain in school more years and thus to reach higher educational levels. Each generation continues to find more students in colleges and universities. The facilities and training of teachers even in the poorer schools, are constantly improving. National accrediting and similar agencies exert more and more influence in setting and enforcing minimal standards.

Despite such trends there is little indication of greater unity in the thinking of the American people about the place and function of schools in the national life, and controversies appear to multiply through time rather than to diminish. It is obvious that the extension and increase of education have not reduced social problems; and education, as represented by the school, has yet to prove itself a panacea for any one social problem. Although formal education may have some relationship to the general rise in living standards and levels, it is not clear just what that relationship is, or that education has improved general occupational adjustment. There is no clear indication that extensive formal education has markedly improved the quality of citizenship or political leadership.

Summary

Problems of education and schools in American culture stem largely from inconsistencies and conflicts in popular and professional attitudes toward them. More than other peoples, Americans tend to venerate education in the abstract to the extent of thinking of it as the panacea for all social ills, and as a result they confront the school system with many impossible tasks. At the same time, it is typically American to hold suspect, and be antagonistic toward, the school in its concrete manifestations, such as its personnel of teachers and administrators, and its curricular and extracurricular activities, to the extent of placing obstacles in the way of better fulfillment of school functions.

The various emphases placed by different social sciences upon schools reflect, in part, confusion of thinking, even at the professional level. The political science viewpoint is shown in the rationalization of the school system on the grounds that it prepares people for enlightened and better citizenship, the actuality of which expectation has not been clearly demonstrated in our national and school history. The economic point of view justifies formal education because it presumably prepares individuals for useful vocations and improves their earning power. Although we do have a history of rising living standards and levels, the precise relationship of schools to this trend is not clear; nor is it obvious that there has been general improvement in occupational adjustment due to the extension and expansion of educational opportunities. The sociological emphasis is reflected in emphasis upon school as it affects total personality, rather than specifically the political or economic aspects of it; and as it aids toward a total adjustment to the whole society. This does not simplify, but greatly complicates, problems of ends and means in a rapidly changing and heterogeneous culture such as our own.

Within this framework of ideological differences the educational system has had a continuous history of growth and expansion, so that every child in each generation has greater opportunity of school attendance spends more hours a day and more days a year in school, and continues to constantly rising levels of educational attainment.

Terms

Ambivalence
Cultural orientations
Formal education
Curriculum
Extracurricular
Rationalism
Indoctrination
Accrediting agencies
Equalization
Vocational
Truancy
Pre-school
Counselor
Venerate

READING LIST

Beulah Amidon, *Democracy's Challenge to Education.* Farrar & Rinehart, 1940.

J. M. Barzun, *Teachers in America.* Little Brown & Co., 1945.

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education.* The Macmillan Co., 1936.

Newton Edwards, *Equal Educational Opportunities for Youth.* American Council of Education, 1939.

J. C. Knode (ed.), *An American Philosophy of Education.* D. Van Nostrand Co., 1942.

B. F. Pettenger, *Indoctrination for American Democracy.* The Macmillan Co., 1941.

W. C. Reavis, *Significant Aspects of American Life and Post-War Education.* University of Chicago Press, 1944.

J. S. Roucek and Associates, *Sociological Foundations of Education.* Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1942.

P. F. Valentine (ed.), *Twentieth Century American Education.* Philosophical Library, 1946.

Willard Waller, *The Sociology of Teaching.* John Wiley & Sons, 1932.

PART III

Applications and Limitations

CHAPTER XXI

Social Problems and the Social Sciences

The purpose of the descriptions and analyses of social problems which have taken up most of the chapters of this book has been to introduce the student to social sciences. Because social problems, in themselves, are somewhat dramatic and often of great interest, it is easy to become so absorbed in the problems as such as to lose sight of the principal intention of the course. This, and the following chapters, will return to the more basic considerations as suggested in the opening chapters of the book and will consider some of the contributions which the survey of social problems makes to an understanding of the social sciences. They may be able, thus, to answer some of the questions which objective study of social problems raises in the minds of students, even though the answers may not be entirely satisfying.

The selection of the problems themselves has been somewhat arbitrary. It has included those which are usually treated under the heading of social problems, and has omitted many others which might as well have been included. But since its intention was to introduce the student to social sciences, it used only a sufficient number and variety of such problems to bring out the main points which are now to be developed. Another list of problems might have done as well, but in any such selection there must be some arbitrary limitations.

Similarities and Differences. Those problems which have been discussed have brought out both similarities and uniformities which run through problems and the unique characteristics and differences to be found in particular problems and groups of problems. As was indicated early in the book, the scientist, as such, is mainly interested in the similarities and uniformities, because only they can serve as the basis for classification, generalization, and the evolving of principles which is the ultimate goal of scientific endeavor. The formula which was elaborated in the first few chapters is an illustration of such a principle which may be drawn from seeking the uniform in a wide variety of social problems—the apparent fact that in each the basic elements are need for change and resistance to change, and that the conflict between the two inevitable forces in group life gives rise to all social problems.

Characteristics of Science

Social sciences are entitled to be called *sciences* to the extent that they share the attributes of all sciences. Relatively few students are destined to be scientists, but all will have reason to know what the term implies, and what it does not mean. While each science has its own distinctive phases, all are basically related through their spirit, aims, methods, and limitations.

The Spirit of Science. The spirit of science, as it is shared by all those engaged in science, is summed up largely in the two words, objectivity and neutrality. Objectivity means the freeing of the mind, as far as possible, from emotional and traditional biases. Man has thought and felt about his universe and himself much more than he has studied them, and his thinking and feeling have become part of every cultural heritage. Especially is this true in the areas which are of interest to social sciences. For every life situation there is a traditional way of thinking or feeling which may have no value in helping to understand the situation, but which nevertheless enters into it unless one remains firmly objective, that is, aware of such elements and able to exclude them from one's thinking.

It is only when one is objective that he is able to see clearly, discern between facts and fictions, and evaluate facts and truths in relation to other facts and truths. There may be, as is often contended, other approaches to understanding than the purely objective, but certainly such other pathways cannot be called scientific without doing violence to the term.[1]

In the case of the social problem of war, the student quite usually shares the feelings and biases of his group, so that the very thought of war may be abhorrent, and everything about war distasteful; or so that war is linked with ideas of glory, courage, and other high cultural values and takes on an imaginative glamour. Either kind of feeling and association tends to unfit such a person for a clear understanding of war, and, unless discarded, debars him from a scientific approach to the problem of war.

Among the biases common to human beings, especially in considering human problems, are those which grow out of the inclination to take sides. Since most social problems are controversial in nature, the temptation is especially strong. Through cultural conditioning we are so certain that we know what is good and what is bad, what is right and what is wrong, that it is only with great effort that we can maintain neutrality in considering such problems. Yet scientific discipline requires

[1] Some of the difficulties of objectivity are discussed in Eleanor Bisbee, "Objectivity in the Social Sciences," *Philosophy of Science*, Vol. IV, 1937, pp. 371-382.

just such neutrality. As soon as a person aligns himself on one side or another in connection with a social problem, he disqualifies himself from studying that problem scientifically. His concern then is to support an ideology, as was shown in a preceding chapter, and not to seek understanding, in the scientific sense.

The Aims of Science. It is true that disregard both for objectivity and neutrality appear to lead more immediately to clear-cut answers and solutions for social problems. It is well to recall, however, that we have had ready answers arrived at through bias and controversy for countless centuries, but our social problems remain with us, seeming to multiply in scope and incidence. Those who are unfettered by the neutrality and objectivity of biology often have surer and easier cures for the common cold or cancer than does the trained physician, but few people would have equal faith in their cures.

The aim of scientific endeavor is to understand completely and thoroughly; and even though scientists may have, as most do, a notion that such understanding may eventually lead to solutions, they cannot remain scientific if they are too immediately occupied with solutions and applications. In the usual division of labor, the scientist seeks knowledge, and the technologist makes applications of such knowledge. As applied to social problems this would mean the social scientist is properly concerned with knowing and understanding, and the reformers and social workers have the task and responsibility of applying what the scientist learns. In this manner both the scientist and the reformer can be more efficient in his work because neither need divide his energies and thoughts between basically incompatible activities.

The Methods of Science. Each science, and each subdivision or specialization within a science, has its own elaborate methodology and set of specialized techniques; but all are founded upon the same fundamental notions of scientific method. Science is fact oriented and is concerned primarily with the observation, classification, and interpretation of facts. This does not exclude theories, for only with theories is it possible for science to bring to facts any coherence, or to extract from them any meaning. Both fact and theory are necessary, the two are closely interrelated, and each lends significance to the other. But when a point is at issue, it is fact which governs and theory which must give way, rather than the other way around.

This latter point is especially pertinent to social sciences, for many theories of human life are older and more firmly entrenched than are the social sciences themselves. Too often there is the inclination, except when there has been rigid scientific discipline, to hold the theory as

sacred and attempt to ignore or reshape facts, rather than to accept fact and revise theories. This tendency, also, was discussed previously, especially in the chapter having to do with ideology, for it is their place in ideologies which tend to make social theories stubborn, even in the face of contrary facts. Those who believe, because of ideological indoctrination, that one family system is superior to another can seldom be convinced of any other notion regardless of the array of facts that may be brought to bear.

Facts and Truth. The question usually arises in such situations as to what are facts. And this suggests the related question of what is truth. In philosophy such questions are answerless because the terms are taken in an absolute sense, but in science they can be answered because both truth and fact are relative terms. Science makes no pretense to finding "ultimate" truths or facts, but only to dealing with what is observable, and drawing from observations the closest approximation it can to facts and truth.

A fact, in science, is an observable event, condition, or experience which can be verified by numerous independent investigators. What cannot be observed by the human senses and the mechanical extensions, which scientific method has devised to aid and sharpen those senses, may be true, but scientifically it cannot be accepted as fact. The verifiability of observations is important, because all minds are subject to deception by senses which serve them. The frightened boy may well see ghosts in the haunted house, just as the poetic lover may see the face of his enamored in the fleeting clouds, but what is seen in each case is fact for science only if such observations may be verified *independently* by other observers.

The bearing of this definition upon social science is obvious for those who have had even a little experience with independent witnesses of social situations. Quite often what they think they have seen, or heard, or smelled, or tasted will vary so from one witness's account to another's that the evidence of all becomes worthless. The well-recognized rules of evidence in court procedures bear witness to this.

In dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency it is not uncommon to find in a group of persons picked at random such a variety of supposed observations of typical delinquent behavior as to completely bewilder the hearer. The variety of pet theories and their lack of unity in connection with this and other social problems bear witness to the relatively unreliable nature of human observation of human events.

For this reason, the supposed observations of each social scientist must be published to other social scientists, so that they may by independent observation test their accuracy before they become widely accepted as

factual. Such publication and checking of observations is routine in all sciences, and is, indeed, indispensable to the development of sciences.

The meaning of truth in science is somewhat different from the meaning of fact. Truth is the product of logic rather than of observations. It is inferred from observation, or from general principles which are generally held to be valid interpretations of facts. The scientific statement of truths is actually or by implications based upon "ifs"; "if" certain things are facts, then it follows logically that another thing is "true."

As between fact and truth in science, the truth is subordinate to facts, if the two appear to be in contrast. If it is advanced as a truth that supply and demand in the open market determine price, but observations of many independent social scientists indicate that other factors enter as importantly or even more importantly into individual transactions, then the "truth" must be modified to conform to the verified facts.

Abstraction and Generalization. A part of the process of all science is abstraction and generalization. The notion sometimes expressed that "facts speak for themselves" has no scientific verification. To the contrary, no fact "speaks" for itself, nor has any meaning in isolation. Each observed fact must be related to others, and from such relationships, interpreted, in order to have meaning. The very terms we necessarily use to describe observed facts suggests their relationship to other facts and their classification in categories.

The process of abstraction is that of drawing from a total event or observation one or a few of the qualities of it. In studying a person, it might be pertinent to one's interest to abstract the single quality of the person's height, and to compare it with the height of other persons; or the color of one's skin, or one's sex. Each of these qualities may be treated, for analytical purposes, in disregard of the multitude of other qualities which may be found in a person. Such a process simplifies classification and comparison.

Mathematics is closely associated with abstraction; and a general rule of science is that the greater the degree of abstraction in a science, the more mathematical its methods. This is especially illustrated in economics, the most abstract of the social sciences,[2] where quite commonly the single quality of price is abstracted from all other qualities which goods and services possess and is used as the basis for classification and comparison.

Social sciences, like other sciences, seek to extend their abstractions as far as possible and thus to become more and more subject to mathematical treatment. This not only greatly enhances the process of gen-

[2] H. G. Moulton, "Scientific Method in the Investigation of Economic Problems," *Scientific Monthly*, March, 1936, pp. 214-221.

eralization, but serves, especially in social sciences, as a check upon the validity of facts. Those facts which can be stated in mathematical terms can much more readily be subjected to verification by independent observers than those which can only be described in words. To say that a person is tall gives but a vague basis for checking one's observation, but to say that a person is six feet one inch high gives a much more precise basis for checking the original observation.

Generalization is a further step in abstraction. It is a reasoning process from which the truths which seem to be applicable to one instance or situation may be applied to a great number of instances and observations. If many specific observations show that in each instance gold is scarce compared with other economic commodities, this paves the way for the generalization that gold is a scarce commodity, with the expectation that such a generalization will be found to be true whenever submitted to an observational test.

It is well to repeat, in connection with generalizations and abstractions, that both are subordinate to facts. If new observations show that facts appear to be different from those indicated by previous observations, then the abstractions and the generalizations based upon the previous observations must be changed to fit the new concept of facts.

Because of this constant reference back to observable and verifiable facts, science, unlike other ways of "knowing" and "understanding," tends to be self-correcting, and those who study carefully any science are impressed by the fact that it is constantly making changes in its supposed "truths' and generalizations, as observational techniques improve.

Principles and Laws. All science attempts to induce principles and laws which are the highest order of generalization, most removed from the original factual observations, and most applicable to the whole range of particular kinds of phenomena. The laws of economics are broad generalizations derived from a great many factual observations, and presumably may be applied to explain wide areas of phenomena of a related kind. The so-called Gresham's law—that where good money and bad money circulate in the same money market, the bad money drives out the good—is a generalization based upon abstractions from many observations of concrete transactions in which money has been involved. Having been dignified as a law, the generalization may presumably be used to explain events taking place in money markets anywhere and at any time.

The principle shared by sociology and cultural anthropology that morality is a cultural variable again is a generalization drawn from many observations on the parts of many students of cultures, who have abstracted from their observations those which had particular bearing

upon morality. Having become established as a principle, the generalization may be used to explain much about cultures which otherwise would be difficult to understand.

Test of Prediction. While laws and principles are used to explain observations, once they have been established and accepted in a science, they are equally important as the bases for predictions. Not only may Gresham's law be used to explain what is happening in a particular money market, and the principle that morality is a cultural variable to explain the behavior of a particular group of people, but both, insofar as they have scientific validity, may be used to predict what will happen in an imaginary situation in the future. The greatest value and ultimate test of a science's findings is their use for precise prediction. If the economist can say with certainty that the introduction of a low grade of money into a given market *will* bring certain specific results, to that extent his science meets its most rigid test. And to the extent that the cultural anthropologist can say that a people *will* behave in certain ways because of the relativity of their morality, his science is meeting the most difficult test.

It is in the field of prediction that science has shown demonstrable advantage over other supposed ways of "knowing" and "understanding." With all his limitations, the social scientist has been able to predict more accurately the chances of success of a marriage, or of the success of a convict on parole, than have those who based prediction on other than scientific means.[3]

There is significance in this for the relation of social science to the solution of social problems. Such solutions, presumably, lie in manipulating causal factors in such a way as to bring about desired results. Only if the degree of predictability is high can any remedy be relied upon to bring about the anticipated effects.

Science and Common Sense

Although the description given of the spirit, aims, and methods of science appears elaborate and involved, it does not differ widely from what is usually considered the application of common sense to problems—human or otherwise. You and I, confronted by a problem, are apt, in a general way, to follow through steps much like those of the scientist, but without, probably, the rigid controls over our efforts that he is subject to.

[3] H. Hart, "Predicting Parole Success," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. XIV, 1923, pp. 405-413; E. W. Burgess and L. S. Cottrell, Jr., "The Prediction of Adjustment in Marriage," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. I, 1936, pp. 737-751.

If a child misbehaves, parents, by common sense, seek to understand the misbehavior. They recall observations of the child and other children, and compare their independent observations to check their accuracy, if not in precisely a scientific spirit, at least in a quest for understanding. From these various observations they abstract certain phases. They may select particular phases, such as the type of punishment administered in each case, and the apparent effects of the punishment in bringing about conforming behavior. From these selected or abstracted phases they generalize, draw principles which they may apply to their own child, predicting what the result will be.

The differences between such random application of common sense and scientific method are significant, as are the similarities. In the case of common sense, the method is usually applied haphazardly and without conscious realization of necessary safeguards; whereas in science the method is systematic and carried out under rigid rules. In the case of the common-sense analysis, usually the range of observation is limited; but in science that range is extended to great numbers of independent observations, all serving as checks on the accuracy of the others. In science, properly carried through, careful further observations are made to check the accuracy of prediction; but quite often such considerations are lost sight of in the preoccupation of applying remedies by the common-sense method, so that those who use the common-sense approach seldom know precisely how accurate their predictions were.

There is much of the common-sense approach in the analysis of social problems, and most of our traditional folk wisdom arises from it. That does not condemn it as valueless or lacking in validity; much of it will stand rigid tests as well as the most advanced findings of social scientists. On the other hand, a great deal of it is obviously without value. The great difference between folk wisdom derived from common-sense methods and social-science findings is that the former gains sanctity and prestige with usage and thus is not subordinate to verifiable fact. Folk wisdom, then, may continue to give "answers" to problems even when the "facts' on which it is supposed to be based have been demonstrated as questionable or false.

It is a matter of common-sense folk wisdom for many that the poor are so because they deserve to be, and no number of verifiable observations counter to the generalization will change this notion in those who hold to it. In this way they differ from the social scientist who is bound to alter his generalizations when facts indicate that they are out of keeping with facts. This quality of scientific method has led to the general criticism of the social scientist that he is inconclusive and timid in his generalizations by comparison with the supposedly hardier souls who advance their conclusions and stick to them in disregard of factual evi-

dence. As will be noted later, and has been previously, there is probably room in the world for both kinds of persons and both kinds of reasoning, and each has its own utility.

Some Warnings

The role of the social scientist in his effort to be objective about the very group life from which he draws his substance and satisfactions make it necessary that he have certain warning signals to keep him at his task and within the bounds of scientific discipline. Because certain trends of thought have been shown to be strong temptations to draw him from his pursuit of understanding into more tempting activities, a few of these might well be noted.

The Can't Notion. The most prevalent block to social science is the idea that human group life cannot be analyzed or understood. It contains the idea that society is a vast confusion of free acting individuals who individually and collectively baffle all efforts at scientific study. This type of thinking, itself, is illustrative of the kind of common-sense folk wisdom discussed above, for that is where it arises. It is generalization which refuses to be subordinated to known and observable facts.

The facts are that understanding and prediction of group life are widespread and commonplace, else no one could adjust or live in society. By the time we reach maturity, all of us gain a considerable fund of useful knowledge and make accurate interpretations of that knowledge. Everyone of us engages constantly in predicting group phenomena, and on the basis of such prediction, which is often accurate, we plan our own life activities.

Social science then need only extend and improve upon, and make more precise, the observations and understanding which already exist to justify its efforts. This it has done, demonstrably, in many fields of study and endeavor. It would be to disregard what exists and has been done to conclude that no further extensions of knowledge and refinement of interpretations are possible.

Taking Sides. Probably one of the reasons why social science is considered as a hopeless undertaking is that the social scientist often is little concerned with winning arguments. Since so many of the problems he deals with are controversial, it is difficult for people to see them outside the context of debate, in which the winning of an argument is mistaken for the establishment of a fact or truth.

Nevertheless, the scientist, being a part of his group and its culture, is often drawn into controversies and uses his supposed scientific findings

to support one side against another in such controversies.[4] Such involvement, of course, means that he is likely to close his eyes to some facts and exaggerate others, which destroys his objectivity, and in that particular regard, his value as a scientist. The satisfaction of being on the winnning side may be well worth the sacrifice of scientific principle in any particular case, but that does not mean that any contribution has been made to science. Partisanship almost invariably closes the mind to scientific fact and truth, and thus makes scientific endeavor, to that extent, impossible.

Fixing Blame. Equal to the temptation of taking sides on social issues is that of finding someone or something to "blame" for a condition. Science is unconcerned with blame, which is the field of the moralist. It is true that scientists, like others, must have moral principles, and therefore, in practical life activities, must occasionally place blame on themselves or some person or thing; but this does not obviate the fact that such blame fixing is a departure from scientific principles and adds nothing to scientific knowledge or understanding.

There are several favorite blame fixing patterns in our culture, and all of them at times tempt the social scientist. One of the chief is that of fixing the blame for social problems on a person. In the years leading up to and during the Second World War, many scientists like others proclaimed that a person who had assumed the name of Hitler was to blame for social ills generally. Since the war, they have been as insistent that another person with the assumed name of Stalin is to blame for social maladjustments. Such blame fixing is as old as human literature, and probably goes back much further; but it has yet to be demonstrated that it has led to better understanding of a single social problem.

Blame fixing also often follows the pattern of holding "human nature" responsible for the world's ills. "As long as human nature is what it is . . ." and "You can't change human nature" are typical expressions of the idea. As elaborated in the preceding chapter, there is also the strong inclination to fix the blame on some "system," usually one which exists only in an ideology but which is supposed to disrupt normal relations among men and the normal functioning of their group life.

It is a necessary part of the equipment of a social scientist that he be aware of and recognize the potency of these tempting by-paths in the study of social problems. Being aware of them, he is in a position to guard his work against them and to recognize them in the work of oth-

[4] On this problem, see G. A. Lundberg, "Contemporary Positivism in Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. IV, 1939.

ers. Thus in the exchange of criticism among many social scientists, all on guard for such influences, science again may be largely self-correcting, and social scientists as a group may be much freer of them than could any one social scientist working in isolation from his colleagues.

Appeal to Authority. Another substitute for scientific method of dealing with social problems is the uncritical appeal to authorities. Such appeals may be made to anyone whose name carries prestige, regardless of whether the person is competent in the social field. In the controversies over social problems and proposed panaceas, a large part of the argument is of this nature. Social scientists often use it, but it contributes little or nothing to the understanding of the problems. Many of the names in the social science fields are appealed to, and their theories are accepted without reference to the growing fund of factual knowledge which has placed at the disposal of modern social scientists a much wider base of verified observations than the earlier theorist had.

Even though persons are regarded as authorities in social science, their theories and generalizations must still be subordinated to facts, if the method of analysis is scientific. To accept uncritically the opinions of any person lends itself to the perpetuation of error,[5] and only by constantly being subordinated to observable and verifiable facts can such theories be of any service in promoting knowledge.

Relevance for the Student

Most of the beginning students of social sciences probably will not become social scientists, but a knowledge of the pitfalls in thinking about social problems can be a part of the equipment of all, and help them to distinguish among and evaluate the multitude of claims and counterclaims which they will encounter in controversies over social problems. Every student will find himself involved in some phase of social problems during most of his life and will find that he cannot escape responsibility for making some decisions in these fields. The questions and problems in these fields are so many, and often demand such rapid decisions, that it is impossible even for the social scientist to be constantly equipped with all the factual knowledge or scientific principles which might be applied. At best he can be on guard against the kind of errors which have played such a large part in the thinking of past, and still do for most persons in the present; and can realize the futility of the many blind alleys of human thinking about their own group life.

5 An example has been the persistence of instinct theory, as popularized by William MacDougall, in the social sciences. For a critical examination of the instinct concept, see L. L. Bernard, *Instinct: a Study in Social Psychology*, Henry Holt & Son, 1924.

Summary

The description and analysis of social problems in this book have necessarily been selected and abbreviated and are intended to acquaint the student with the social sciences and their methods. Social sciences are a part of all sciences and are subject to the same rigid rules. They are fact-oriented, as science understands facts; and, while facts must be related to other facts, classified, and so become the basis for abstraction and generalizations, the generalizations must always remain subordinate to facts. This is the proved method of science, and its disregard in social sciences or the study of social problems only leads into blind alleys which tend to perpetuate errors rather than contribute to knowledge or understanding.

The acceptance of the notion that social science *cannot* be factual, or that social phenomena defy understanding, ignores the obvious facts that all of us, whether social scientists or not, do have a considerable knowledge and understanding of group life. The tendency to emphasize blame-fixing in connection with social maladjustments, whether the blame be fixed on persons, or human nature, or "the system," adds nothing to understanding; nor does the notion that winning an argument establishes a fact or truth, in the scientific sense. And the uncritical appeal to the prestige of authorities serves no useful scientific purpose.

Science has much in common with common sense, but in addition it is systematic and guards itself more rigidly against error; and to a large extent, through constantly rechecking its generalizations against facts, and the critical interplay of thought among scientists, science is self-correcting.

Terms

Objectivity
Methodology
Discipline
Verifiable
Abstraction
Generalization
Validity
Principle
Scientific law
Categories
Folk wisdom
Arbitrary
Implication

Questions

1. What are some of the similarities possessed by all social problems?
2. What distinguishes scientific approach to such problems from other approaches?
3. Why must scientific generalizations always be subordinate to facts?
4. What are some of the pitfalls which often defeat efforts to promote understanding of social phenomena?
5. How may uncritical acceptance of authority perpetuate errors?
6. Should students who will not be social scientists have a knowledge of how social

READING LIST

A. F. Bentley, *Behavior Knowledge Fact.* Principia Press, 1935.
P. W. Bridgeman, *The Intelligent Individual and Society.* The Macmillan Co., 1938.
Stuart Chase, *The Tyranny of Words.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.
John Dewey, *The Quest for Certainty.* Allen & Unwin, 1930.
A. Korzybski, *Science and Sanity.* Science Press, 1933.
T. Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.
James Harvey Robinson, *The Story of Human Error.* D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.
E. Schroedinger, *Science and Human Temperament.* Norton Publishing Co., 1935.
T. Veblen, *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization.* Viking Press, 1932.

CHAPTER XXII

Common Ground of the Social Sciences

There are two approaches to the study of social sciences—one by way of social problems, as illustrated in this book, and the other through the study of the principles of the various sciences. The approach through principles tends to emphasize differences among the sciences, whereas that through social problems helps to bring out their essential uniformities and the common ground which they share. This is generally true of human problems, whether they are those which are considered of sufficient general concern to call social problems or are more limited individual and family problems. Each of us as an individual is constantly confronted by problems, as, for example, the college student in his selection of a field of study. These problems seldom classify neatly as economic, or historical, or sociological, or other, in terms of the recognized social sciences. Usually they contain elements of all these, and we must draw upon our knowledge and understanding gained from each discipline to reach a solution.

Throughout life the individual finds his problems are complicated by a variety of considerations, and only at the expense of a well-rounded view can they be reduced to the elements which would place them in a single social science field, as purely economic, political, or social.

With family groups in meeting their routine problems, this is even more evident, because, here, usually, is involved some meeting of minds, and the minds will have different backgrounds of experience and orientations in future expectations. As groups are extended to take in more and more people, their problems become more complex and tend increasingly to cut across all fields of knowledge and understanding.

Social Problems. Social problems, as we have noted in other chapters, may, for convenience, be classed as economic, political, social, historical, socio-psychological, or anthropological. But classifying the problem does not erase the basic fact, noted in many of the preceding chapters, that each social problem requires for complete understanding the viewpoints of all of the social sciences. The problem of war cuts across all fields and is an area of study for each; the same is true of the problem of poverty,

or of family organization. And so, throughout the entire list, it may be clearly seen that insofar as social sciences grow out of and concentrate upon social problems, they are on common ground and inseparable.

In the technological or applied phases of these sciences, those who have a background in all social sciences are better equipped for dealing with their work. The social worker trained in all social sciences can better see her task than one who is trained in only one or two. The business executive or governmental administrator is similarly better prepared if his training has included all the social disciplines, not simply because they are "broadening" but because from each there is something of practical advantage to be learned.

Unity of Human Life

What social problems reveal in the close interrelationship and common ground of social sciences is simply a reflection of the nature of human life itself. Whether viewed from the individual viewpoint and stressing the experiences of a particular person, or collectively and emphasizing group ways, human life has essential unity in which its various aspects blend so as often to be indistinguishable. People were living as individuals and groups long before any of the social sciences came into being, and it is only since the advent of the various academic disciplines that emphasis has been placed upon the supposed segmented nature of human life.

Any person who will carefully follow his own activities and experiences through a single day will find how indiscriminately he passes from the economic to the political, to the familial or other realm without stopping to note that any transition is being made. In one moment he is a student, in another a companion, in the next a customer or salesman, and perhaps, at another time, deep in religious activity or contemplation.

The same observation could be made from careful study of the life of a community, a nation, or any other group of people whether large or small.[1] Even the business group in a store or office is intent upon more things than purely economic activities. There are office politics, flirtations, gossip and scandal, recreation, and many other kinds of occupations and preoccupations; and when the variety is insufficient, usually there are plans to enliven and vary them to increase group morale.

Subject Matter. It is human group life which makes up the subject

[1] The variety of aspects which enter into routine community life is well illustrated by Robert S. and Helen Lynd, *Middletown*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929, which, incidentally, was a study based upon the use of a combination of sociological and anthropological techniques.

matter of all of the social sciences. The unity of human life discussed above extends beyond the moment or the day, and even beyond the generation, as both anthropology and history clearly show. No matter what the type of activity, it is influenced by folkways, mores, and institutionalized patterns which come from the past and it must be seen partly in terms of that past to be completely comprehended.

When we speak of economics as being the study of man's activities in producing and consuming goods and services, we exclude very little of group life from that study. The person who calmly contemplates the stars on a summer evening is enjoying leisure, which is an economic value, to be won by economic effort and sacrifice. The waging of war is an economic undertaking, and the formation or disruption of family ties has economic antecedents and economic results. There is nothing in our group life which the economist may not study with some profit for his understanding, and there is very little of it which some economist at some time has not studied.

This is even more obviously true of the student of political science. Government enters or refrains deliberately from entering all phases of personal and collective life and intervenes when any other institutional aspect of group activities fails. As has been noted in the discussion of political organization and activities, extralegal politics is the art of bringing equilibrium to a host of competing interest groups whose varying interests encompass everything from religion to dress styles.

The sociologist and social psychologist, like the historian and anthropologist, wander freely over the entire range of human activities and relationships with little regard for whether they are labeled economic, political, educational, ethical, or simply frivolous.[2]

The subject matter is precisely the same for all social sciences, and no part of it is set off as the exclusive ground for any of them. Many of the most virile fields within the social sciences are those which are obviously overlapping fields, as public finance, social security, and international relations.[3]

In this relationship it is often misleading to think of the social sciences as "fields" of knowledge, because the word "field" is apt to conjure up an unrealistic vision of an exclusive area with a fence around it. To think of the social sciences in such terms leads to impossible positions and unnecessary controversy, while gaining nothing. Each of the social sciences has gained most by considering itself broadly as far as subject

[2] R. E. Park, "Sociology and the Social Sciences," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vols. XXVI and XXVII, 1930 and 1931.

[3] "The Relations of the Social Sciences, A Symposium," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XIII, 1907.

matter is concerned and has, in this manner, contributed most to other social sciences.

Some Trends. Some recent trends in various social sciences are pertinent in this connection. In summary, it may be said that they have been recognizing more and more fully the scope of their work as all-encompassing as far as human group life is concerned.

Anthropologists have been outstanding in this regard in the last few years. Refusing to be confined to the study of primitive, preliterate, and non-European peoples, they have given more attention to modern people of our own culture, with fruitful results not only for anthropology, but for all other social sciences.

Political science has shown a recent inclination to absorb the findings of anthropologists and sociologists and have given more and more attention to the observation of attitudes, and even of abnormal psychology—matters which by a narrow definition would be considered outside their proper realm, but which they realize are a necessary part of their understanding of politics and government.

The history of economics has included many notable excursions by economists into broader areas of human behavior than the term was once thought to imply. In the future economists are apt to study the place of economic activity and processes in the total life of nations and communities.

Historians are less apt to be confined, than was formerly true, to the chronicling of battles and the reigns of kings and are more likely to study the whole society of given periods.[4]

New Approaches. The essential unity of the social sciences is recognized in a number of new trends both in academic and research fields. Among these are the development of survey and other courses in colleges and universities which are designed to break down, to some extent, the interdepartmental boundaries of the various disciplines and to emphasize the contributions which all can make to a common human understanding.

Area studies, which have been developed by some institutions both as the core for instruction of students and for productive research, are another example. In such studies a given area of the earth's surface is taken as the subject matter to be investigated and analyzed, and the findings of all the social sciences, together with those of pertinent physical sciences, are combined in the search for complete understanding of the area, its resources, climate, people, customs, history, and all those

[4] I. C. McLaughlin, "History and Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXXII, 1926, pp. 379-395.

factors which are so intricately intertwined in human group life wherever it is found.

Other instances of the recognition of the unity of social sciences are to be found in the "institutes of human relations" or similar research organizations, where scientists from various fields, including often some not usually considered as social scientists, combine their efforts in the solution of given human problems and the better understanding of human behavior.[5]

Common Backgrounds

Although recent developments and trends are recognitions of the essential unity of the social sciences, a study of their past is even more impressive in this regard. All social sciences have a common origin in and heritage from social philosophy which has had a much longer history than any of the social sciences. As far back as there are records we have glimpses of man's social philosophy, which includes his speculations and reasoning about all phases of group and individual life. All social scientists refer back, on occasion, to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the group of ancient Athenian philosophers whose works have been highly esteemed through many centuries. These philosophers were interested in all that man did, thought, and felt, whether it was the work of the artisan, the social class arrangements, the system of government, the organization of families, or the history and prehistory of peoples.

Philosophy of History. A part of the common heritage of the social sciences constitutes various philosophies of history which gained wide attention in modern times, and all of which have attempted to interpret the whole of human group-life phenomena. Such philosophies have been, for the most part, deductive—that is, working from certain general principles which are supposed to have governed man's historical development and applying these principles in broad interpretations of facts. The writings of Vico, Montesquieu, and Buckle were of this nature, as have been the later writing of Marx and Ellsworth Huntington. Among the contemporary historical philosophers to gain wide attention has been Arnold J. Toynbee.

The various philosophies of history all draw upon and cut across the various social fields of specialization and seek to find common clues to all events whether economic, political, or otherwise social. We are not interested in these various interpretations here except that they are indicative of seeking for the unity in understanding human group life on the part of many students and thinkers.

[5] R. M. Hutchins, "An Institute of Human Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXXV, 1929, pp. 187-193.

"The" Social Science. The quest for *the* social science, or one which will synthesize and unify all social knowledge and understanding, has been one phase of their development. Early historians made little differentiation between man's history and his prehistory. The first economists called themselves political economists, encompassing in their studies government and politics as well as what would now be considered the "purely" economic. August Comte and Herbert Spencer, as pioneers of sociology, believed that theirs was the all-embracing science of human society.

The quest for a key or dominant social science ended with the nineteenth century, but the heritage which it left for the various social sciences remains and affects their viewpoints and work to a considerable extent.

Unity of Method

Further essential unity of the social sciences is found in the methods which they have found adapted to their observations and study. Each has found it profitable, on occasion, to borrow methods developed in others, and all use largely the same set of techniques in their studies, even though some may appear better adapted to the problems or more useful at the stage of development of particular social sciences or special branches within them.[6]

Statistical Method. Favored among the social scientists as a means of study of their various phenomena is the statistical method, in which the data are reduced to mathematical symbols and mathematical devices are then used to determine and measure relationships among the data. The crudest of statistical devices is that of the simple count of like units. Among the best-known and widely available counts are those made in various nations of their populations, and all social sciences place large reliance upon published census materials.

The simple count, while presenting a type of fact that is subject to verification, seldom yields significant truths. These begin to develop in more complex mathematical manipulations, such as comparisons and measurement, which is one type of comparison. When one unit may be compared with another in some way, then each takes on greater significance. If a great number of units may be compared, the significance is usually enhanced and the way opened for generalizations. Such comparisons may be made, statistically, at a given moment or period of time, or at different times. In the latter case they reveal trends, which have their own kind of significance.

---

[6] A. F. Bentley, "Remarks on Method in the Study of Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXXII, 1926, pp. 456-460; and A. W. Small, "Are the Social Sciences Answerable to Common Principles of Method?" *ibid*, Vol. XIII, 1907.

If one counts the people in a community, the sum arrived at has little meaning by itself. But if the count is compared with that made of the number of people in another community, then one stands out as larger or smaller than the other. A dozen, or a hundred, or thousand communities can be arranged in ranks of population size, and the place of each in the ranking order has its own kind of significance. If the counts are made for each of the series of communities every ten years or fifty years, then the trend of growth or shrinkage in population for each may be seen, and thus further significant truths about the various communities and their relationships to each other may be gained.

It is difficult to envision social sciences without such crude statistical devices, for almost all of their findings include, either explicitly or implicitly, references to counts and trends, and comparisons among groups of units of various kinds.

Beyond these very simple mathematical manipulations, statistics include more advanced kinds of devices, such as averages, measurement of central tendencies, correlation analysis, index numbers, and measurements of probable error. All of these are commonplace to the research worker in the social science fields, although much more used in some social sciences and specialized fields than in others.

For social scientists mathematical devices have the advantages of precision, offer solutions to complex interrelationships that are difficult to solve or state except statistically, and especially they give the social scientist a means of treating his materials impersonally and objectively.

Historical Method. The historical method is also used by all social sciences as a useful tool for amassing factual data and interpreting them. This method is based upon the scrutiny and study of written records of various kinds, ranging from official documents to personal diaries, the purpose being to reconstruct events of past periods. The anthropologist must often rely upon other than written records since he deals frequently with periods and peoples which are preliterate, and therefore have no written records. His general approach is closely akin to that of the scientific study of historical documents, because it includes the comparisons of available materials bearing upon the same event or sequence of events in an effort to get as true a picture of the past as possible, and to determine interrelationships among various events or sequences.

Economists are interested in economic history, political scientists in political and governmental history, and the sociologist in the history of various institutional phases of life, as the history of the family. All social scientists are interested in the history of immigration, or of world migrations; the history of law and jurisprudence, and of other particular phases of the human past.

Case Studies. Similarly, the case study is used to some extent in all social sciences, although it is used much more in anthropology and sociology than in economics, political science, or history. The case study may be the intensive study of an individual, as of the individual juvenile delinquent; or of a small group, as the Juke family; or of small communities which are so closely knit in inter-personal relationships that the story of the whole group may be considered as a case.

The case study overlaps both the historical method and the statistical. A study such as that of Peter Odegard of the prohibition movement in the United States during a particular period might be considered a case study in political science, or an historical document.[7] When case studies are amassed in considerable numbers centering in some particular set of phenomena, as those of criminals, they may well become the basis for significant statistical analysis, as is shown in the work of the Gluecks.[8]

The Survey. Another method, which overlaps and combines those already mentioned, is the survey which is used especially in sociology, economics, and political science, and to a lesser extent in anthropology and history. The survey may be made of a particular community or other territorial area, or of the circumstances surrounding a particular problem or set of problems, as in the case of a survey of school systems or newspaper circulation.

The survey uses a number of specific devices to bring together many kinds of data regarding its particular subject of interest. It attempts a comprehensive understanding of the interlocking forces and facts which enter into the complex arrangements of modern group life.

Other Devices. Some of the other devices of the social sciences, and those which they share to a large extent, include the questionnaire, the schedule, the interview, in many variations, all of which are more or less mechanical extensions of personal observations which presumably are subject to verification. The questionnaire can be broadcast to large numbers of persons to get their opinions or factual information in standardized form, susceptible to statistical treatment. The schedule may be placed in the hands of numerous investigators and enables them to cover a wide range of informants and subjects, producing standard information, also capable of being treated statistically. The interview is more limited as a research device and is, for most purposes, used for intensive study of a few rather than many subjects; but when combined with the schedule, as in some modern polling devices, it may be used extensively in much the same way as the schedule.

---

[7] *Pressure Politics*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.

[8] S. and E. Glueck, *500 Criminal Careers*, Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.

More recent experiments have been made with various sociometric devices, so-called, whose purpose it is to extend the range of observation of the investigator, and especially to reduce qualitative data, such as opinions and attitudes, to quantitative terms for measurement and statistical treatment. Such devices have had their principal use in social psychology, but have also been adopted to a limited extent in sociology, economics, and political science.

Generalizations and Theories

The findings resulting from studies in each of the social sciences are often useful, and occasionally indispensable, to other social sciences; and interchange of current researches could be much more general and useful were it not for the practical difficulties involved in keeping abreast of the research activities in each of the many specialized fields. The early studies made by Engel of the family budgets of coal miners have been of value to economists, political scientists, historians, and sociologists, in their quest for understanding the various aspects of group life in which they are interested. Engel found that, among those he studied, the smaller the family income, the larger the proportion of that income that went for the bare necessities, and the lesser the proportion for such things as savings, self-improvement, and recreation. With some slight changes, this "law" has been extended to other population groups and has helped greatly in the understanding of consumption habits and the incidence of poverty, taxation, etc. Obviously his generalizations are of value to all social sciences.

The study of primitive peoples by such anthropologists as Margaret Mead, Malinowski, and others, has been helpful to sociologists and social psychologists and, on occasion, to other social scientists in the interpretation of their materials and the solutions of their particular problems. Mead's demonstration that the problems of adolescence are of cultural rather than of physiological origin gave new insight into the relation of group ways to individual and group adjustments and maladjustments, and added to the knowledge of the individual learning process.

The list of valuable contributions of one social science to others would be a long one. Such contributions serve to emphasize the basic unity and close interrelationships among the social sciences. Not only is this found in the factual contributions that each makes, but also in the interplay of theories among them.[9]

The idea that cultures are rooted in myths and beliefs which are uncritically accepted by group members has spread from anthropology

[9] J. C. Cobb, "Social Sciences," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXXI, 1925, pp. 721-732.

to sociology, eventually to penetrate the theories of government and economics, as is shown in the works of Thurmond Arnold and Thorstein Veblen. The various economic "laws" are generally useful, even though often with qualifications, in all of the social sciences. And theories of social psychology are used increasingly to help explain all phases of group life.

Numerous other examples could be cited to show how the principles, laws, and theories of all social sciences are valuable and become integrated into other social sciences. There they help, often, to correct existing notions, or to solve problems for which solutions are not obvious in the framework of a particular social science's own theoretical constructs.

Common Problems

The social sciences all deal with human beings and their behavior, and therefore they share a number of common problems inherent in such study. They all present the difficulties, some of which were listed in the previous chapter, related to the biases and prejudices in which all people, including those who become social scientists, are trained. In differing degrees there has been a strong tendency in all of them to view our own culture and its ways as the only, or at least the normal, way of doing, thinking, or feeling. In recent decades the comparative studies of cultures has corrected this common error to some extent, but it still remains a recurring obstacle to understanding.

The social sciences also encounter the taboos which surround the privacy of individuals and groups in some phases of their living and make it difficult to gain reliable information about such realms of living. This has been particularly true in various studies of family relationships and life, whether the study be of the economics of the family budget, the relations of family to law, or other phases of its life. Either ingenious methods must be devised to break through such taboos, or the social scientists must be satisfied with incomplete or unverifiable information.

The social sciences share problems of terminology because they all borrow some of their technical terms from everyday discourse where meanings are inexact and confused, and a part of such confusion or lack of precision tends to creep into their scientific usage. Note has previously been made of some such terms as "institution" and "value," and many more could be listed. Even when the social sciences develop their own terms, these often are adopted in everyday speech and thus become distorted in meaning, to the confusion, in turn, of the social scientist. None of the social sciences has a clear-cut terminology as is found in all of the natural sciences.

Shared by the social sciences is their relative immaturity. The latest among the sciences to originate, they are all in stages of development which the physical sciences have long since passed, so that their methods and generalizations are less securely established and have become less refined by usage. The immaturity of the social sciences also contributes to the further fact that they have less prestige with laymen and with scientists in other fields than do the older sciences; and this lack of prestige has led, often, to a type of self-consciousness among social scientists which has made their work hesitant and probably overcautious.

Even though they lack prestige, the social sciences find that they are often expected to perform virtual miracles of problem solving in very complex realms of human behavior and relationships; and, because they may be measured against such impossible expectations, they tend to suffer for falling short of them.

Summary

The study of social sciences may be approached by way of their principles, or through social problems. The former approach emphasizes the differences in their modes of thought; whereas the latter, which has been the approach of this book, stresses their common ground, the interrelationships, and their overlapping. Problems demanding solution either from individuals or groups of people have little respect for the academic lines which are drawn among the disciplines, and quite usually they call for knowledge and understanding in several or all the social sciences if the problem itself is to be clearly or completely seen.

The social sciences have backgrounds in social philosophy and the philosophy of history which have been their common ancestry. It was only with the development out of such philosophies of sciences that differentiations were made between the fields. Even then, as illustrated by political economy, for a long time there were combinations of two or more of the present social sciences in a single discipline. There has been, during the development of social sciences, a continuous effort to develop *the* social science which would include them all and thus give adequate recognition to their essential unity.

The subject matter of the social sciences is identical—group life. No part or phase of group life is exclusively reserved to any social science, but all freely study any and every aspect. In this common undertaking, all have the same techniques and methods, ranging from the historical to the statistical. They also have in common their principal technical problems, which grow out of the biases which enter into the study of human affairs, the lack of precise terminology, and the effects of the relative immaturity which is reflected in relative lack of development and prestige.

Terms

Applied science
Antecedents
Exclusive
Field
Academic
Area study
Philosophy of history
Deductive
Synthesize
Scientific fact
Scientific truth

Questions

1. Why does the problem approach to the study of social sciences emphasize their common ground?
2. What are some of the principal methods of the social sciences?
3. In what types of study are various social scientists brought together to work on a common problem?
4. What difficulties do all the social sciences encounter in their quest for knowledge and understanding?
5. Illustrate from commonly observed life routines how life itself cuts across the interests of all social scientists.
6. Why has it been difficult for social sciences to develop precise terminologies?

READING LIST

H. E. Barnes, *The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences*, Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.
Charles A. Beard, *A Charter for the Social Sciences*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
M. C. Elmer, *Social Research*. Prentice Hall, 1939.
John A. Hackett, *A Determination of the Major Social Problems in American Life*. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.
C. E. Hayes, *Recent Developments in the Social Sciences*. J. B. Lippincott Co., 1927.
J. A. Hobson, *Free Thought in the Social Sciences*. The Macmillan Co., 1926.
F. N. House, *The Range of Social Theory*. Henry Holt & Co., 1929.
H. W. Odum, ed., *Man's Quest for Social Guidance*. Henry Holt & Co., 1927.
H. W. Odum and Katherine Jocher, *An Introduction to Social Research*. Henry Holt & Co., 1929.
W. F. Ogburn and Alexander Goldenweiser, eds., *The Social Sciences and Their Interrelations*. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927.

CHAPTER XXIII

Differences Among the Social Sciences

In view of the preceding chapter with its emphasis upon the basic unity of the social sciences—a unity which stems from common origins, common subject matter, shared techniques and methods, and interplay of findings and theories—the question logically occurs: Why then do we have several social sciences instead of one? There are two answers: one is that many of the divisions are accidental; the other, that the complexity of group life is such that it has required a number of specialized approaches to obtain thorough understanding of its various aspects.

Only one of the social sciences—that is, sociology—was deliberately blueprinted in advance. August Comte, the French philosopher who is credited with founding the science, laid down a fairly complete plan for its development, one which has largely guided the science to the present time, even though minor changes have crept in. The other fields just developed before anyone was aware that they were developing. Usually they represented a chance combination of interests of a number of philosophers and scholars on a particular set of problems which they came to recognize as they concentrated their attention along particular lines. A later development was the effort to differentiate their science from others, and to gain for it academic status with the result of further specialization on the part of students.

The original focus of interest in each case may be accounted for in ideological controversies which took shape in philosophical realms and led those on either side to delve further into their studies to support their arguments. With the rise in prestige of the natural sciences, one of the surest ways to gain support for a particular view was to use the name of science, which in turn led to increasing preoccupation with developing scientific methods to justify the claim.

Economics developed as a science largely because of the controversy between those who advocated a state-controlled economy and those who argued for a free economy, and the work of Adam Smith was a document in that controversy. His work gave a theoretical structure for the investigation of facts to support, refute, or modify his theories.

The theories of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, which became the

framework for political science, grew out of the ideological controversies between those who favored monarchy as a form of government and those who advocated democracy. Probably the work of Malthus was more important for the eventual plans of Comte for sociology than was Comte's own thinking, because Malthus brought to sharp issue the controversy between those who believed in a scientifically planned society and those who opposed the notion, thus raising the question of the possibility and form of a science of society.

Logic of the Social Sciences. The logical necessity for several social sciences lies in the nature of what social sciences study. As groups and cultures have grown and expanded, organized group life has become so complex that it is beyond the capacity of any one person to understand it completely. If one rejects as inadequate the oversimplified and inconsistent folk-wisdom explanations of human society, he is at a loss even as to where to begin in building a scientific understanding. Yet beginnings must be made if anything is to be accomplished, and numerous such beginnings have resulted in numerous avenues of approach. Many have been rejected as not tenable scientifically, and those which have survived roughly correspond to the divisions among the social sciences.

In seeking to understand group life one may start by studying its history, expecting to find there the explanation of why things are as they are; but he finds that history does not go far enough to give the essential answers. A new start may be made by trying to piece together prehistory in an effort to get to the very beginnings of human institutions.

In an age and culture largely dominated by economic institutions, one may well begin to seek understanding of human society by concentration on man's economic activities; whereas another may look upon government as the most inclusive form of social organization and concentrate upon the study of the forms of government.

Following this line of reasoning, it can safely be assumed that, if any one of the existing social sciences were to be abolished overnight, it would reappear tomorrow, even though under a different name. This is because there are some questions which must be answered; and in a scientific age they must, if possible, be answered scientifically.

Specialization Trend. Science, like industry, has benefitted greatly by division of labor and specialization. The frontiers of knowledge are pushed ahead more efficiently and rapidly by those who know quite well what they are doing, even in a relatively narrow area, than by those who have generalized knowledge but are not completely equipped in any one specialty.

The trend throughout the history of science, whether in the natural or the social sciences, has been predominantly toward specialization, and the coordinating and synthesizing of the findings have been left chiefly to philosophers. This is probably a trend that will increase rather than diminish, and it will thus intensify differences among sciences and their subdivisions, rather than lessen them.

The student of social sciences, if he pursues his studies in these fields, will find himself increasingly under pressure to narrow his field to a manageable segment, one in which he can be well acquainted with all of the factual and theoretical contributions and in which he can keep abreast of the work done by hundreds of colleagues in the same narrow area. Although there are undesirable as well as desirable consequences from this trend, it is, nevertheless, a fact which cannot be escaped, and one which makes necessary some understanding of the different social sciences, as well as of social sciences in general.

Anthropology

Anthropology gives an outstanding example of the fluidity which is more or less characteristic of all social sciences and which sometimes confuses their study. The science of anthropology has changed greatly during its historical development in its viewpoints and emphases. In its early development it concentrated principally upon the physical nature of man, and thus might well have been classified as a biological rather than a social science. From there its main interest turned to archaeology, the discovery, unearthing, and reconstruction of ancient cities, largely as an adjunct to the study of fine arts and architecture. Later it became the study of primitive and preliterate peoples, and more recently, as has been noted in earlier chapters, it has turned to a study of contemporary man in our civilized world.

As the "science of man," the scope of anthropology is sufficient to allow for this fluidity of principal interest. At present, with the development of its concentration upon culture, anthropology might well be called the study of the evolution of human life ways.

Specialization within Anthropology. Within anthropology there are a number of specialized fields, but in order to keep the analysis simple, they may be considered as three. Although at present the emphasis is upon cultural anthropology, there are still physical anthropologists and archaeologists. The physical anthropologist is concerned principally with the problem of races and their evolution as physiological types. They have reconstructed the evolution of the human type from early, pre-human physical types largely through the examination of early

skeletal and fossil materials, and their comparison with the somatic characteristics and skull forms of modern man, especially as these modern types differ among racial groups.

The archaeologist, as stated earlier, is interested in discovering the material remains of early peoples—their cities, temples, monuments, implements, utensils, burials, and whatever other evidences have survived which may serve as clues to man's early modes of living and thinking. These, used in conjunction with the findings of physical anthropologists, are the basis for the study of human prehistory, or man's life before there were written records. Many of the findings of the archaeologist, however, are from eras when there were written records, so that he also contributes to the history of man.

The cultural anthropologist is mainly interested in the comparative study of existing cultures, by which he attempts to learn the meaning of culture and all that the term includes; how culture traits and patterns come to be, how they persist and influence human life and thought processes, and how they are related to social organization. It is this field of anthropology that is attracting attention from other social sciences because its contributions have been of great significance for interpretation and reinterpretation of much in human life which had always been assumed to be caused by other than cultural forces.

Relations to Other Sciences. Anthropology illustrates well the intricate interrelationships among sciences which are usually considered as separate. It has been noted that physical anthropology might well be considered a biological science, so closely is it related to human physiology and other biological studies. Both physical anthropology and archaeology have developed a close affinity with geology, for it has been found that the dating of materials called for use of the geological calendar rather than the usual historical calendar, and that much of the supporting evidence by which materials were dated had to come from geological science.

There is an obvious relationship between archaeology and prehistory, and history, because the two merge imperceptibly, and each becomes a logical and natural extension of the other.

The recent focus of attention upon cultural anthropology has made much of present-day anthropology indistinguishable from sociology and social psychology. These sciences, too, are concerned with culture and its influence on human behavior and thought, and use much the same theory and methods as do the cultural anthropologists. As among the social sciences today, there is closer correspondence between cultural anthropology and sociology than between any other sciences of the group.

Economics

Economics contrasts with anthropology in that it has been much more steadfast in its focus of attention, but not so much so as to have prevented some shifts during its developmental history. Early economics grew out of concern over the problem of the extent to which the state should interfere with or control private economic activities. That question was early settled to the satisfaction of the great majority of economists who then shifted their attention to the analysis of private enterprise as such—the study of factors of production, determinants of economic wage, diminishing returns, and other aspects of the operation of supposed free economics. Recently, however, and typifying present economics, is a return to the basic concern with the disputed ground between government and the economy.

The formal definition of economics is that it is the study of the wealth producing and consuming activities of man. If one accepts the proposition, prevalent in the study of economics, that man's economic activities and interests are basic to all others, then the scope of economics becomes as wide as the range of organized group life. Quite usually, although not entirely, the economists have limited their inquiry to contemporary human life and the immediate past—that which is encompassed in the rather vague period of the Industrial Revolution. Customarily, too, the economist has been interested in material phases of culture to the virtual exclusion of others, except to assume that other aspects are outgrowths of strivings for material betterment.

Although not the oldest of the social sciences, economics is the most mature in the scientific sense of having developed the greatest degree of abstraction and having subordinated its factual material most completely to mathematical statement and treatment. This has been possible in economics largely because of the prevalence of money value symbols in buying and selling transactions, under which every commodity in the market place, be it goods or a service, is evaluated in such symbols. This single basis of evaluation in terms which are by their very nature mathematical has made it comparatively easy for the economist to state most of his data in monetary terms, giving him the basis for the development and elaboration of statistical devices. No other social science has advanced as far in this direction.

Divisions within Economics. The principal division in economics is largely ideological and theoretical, but it has had an important bearing on the development of the science. It arises from the two opposing assumptions—on the one hand, that free enterprise capitalism is the normal and natural scheme of economic activity; and, on the other, that

capitalism is a conspiracy of the few to exploit the many. This question cannot be resolved within the realm of the science of economics, but it has had much to do with the interpretations which economists have made of their data.

Another division within the field, not itself scientific in its nature, but reflecting again significant facts about the science, is that between theoretical economics and practical or applied economics. Theoretical economics is largely deductive, reasoning from general propositions and principles to other propositions and principles; whereas practical economics is more empirical, constantly checking theories to statistical evidence and working on the basis of the evidence rather than the principle.

It is in practical economics—because it is closer to the factual data—that the greatest flexibility is found in economics. Here it has been found, through the empirical method, that economic activities and concern cannot be neatly segregated from other phases of living, and that the economist must know more of human nature, cultural forces, and other social phenomena than the theory of economics admits. In this field there have developed such specializations as personnel management, market analysis, and labor relations which transcend the usual abstractions of the science.

Relation to Other Fields. Because economics is, in a scientific sense, the most mature of the social sciences, we may note two types of relationship to other sciences. The one is methodological; the other, one of subject matter. Economics has set the pace for other social sciences in subjecting its data to quantitative and mathematical controls, and the development of statistical method as used in all sciences has been largely a by-product of economics. Other social sciences have adopted and adapted the statistical methods of economics, but none has advanced so far in this direction.

The greater maturity of economics in this line of development has given confidence and assurance to economists, so that they speak more freely and definitely than do those in other social science fields of "laws," or the broad generalizations which only mathematical devices can adequately support and test.

In subject matter, economics has remained relatively aloof from other social sciences; but it has drawn, to some extent, upon all of them. Its closest relationship, as the very origin and development of the science would suggest, has been with political science. In fact, political economy combined the two, until recently, into a single discipline. This continuing interdependence is found most clearly illustrated in the specialized field of public finance which is properly and necessarily a con-

cern of both the economist and political scientist. Other interdependencies are found in the study of business law and in their common concern with problems of personnel and administration.

History

Oldest of the social sciences to gain distinct recognition has been history; in fact, the contrast is so great that it must be noted that history was a recognized distinct field for factual study more than 2,000 years ago, whereas no other social science can claim more than, at most, 300 years. This presents a paradox, because of the social sciences, in a scientific sense, history is the least mature. It has the least abstraction, is less subordinated to mathematical treatment, and has a relative lack of principles that may be verified by scientific methods.

One reason for the relative lack of scientific maturity in history is that this science, more than any of the others, is popular; and, in being popular, it has been considered more of a possession of the layman than have other social sciences. Everyone knows what history is, everyone has studied some history, and history has long been considered an indispensable part of the education of everyone. This general interest in history has tended to keep history at a nonscientific level for any but a few specialists, who have attempted to develop and maintain scientific standards.

With the development of nationalism, history was an obvious and readily available instrument for supporting nationalistic ideologies, and it has largely been used for that purpose. That has meant that nearly all history has been biased political history, chronicling the events important to a particular nation and lending support to its particular nationalistic views. Controversies that have stimulated historical research have been those between the adherents of particular nationalistic histories, rather than those between national history and a more catholic history.

The scope of history is broad, as has been noted of the other social sciences—so broad, theoretically, as to exclude nothing in group life and human activity or thought. Actually, however, the nationalistic bias has been a restriction on the theoretical scope, insofar as any particular history is concerned.

Divisions in the Field. Divisions within history have been suggested by what has been said of its nationalistic uses. Most familiar in our own nationalistic treatment of history have been divisions into ancient, medieval, and modern history; and into the history of a relatively few nations which have been closely related in one way or another to our own, such as the history of England and the history of Mexico. For more

intensive scholars there are numerous subdivisions such as the history of particular movements, and such auxiliary histories as the history of economic institutions, the history of the family, or the history of religion.

Relation to Other Fields. History is basic to all other social sciences, and there is none which has not developed its own specialized historical fields. Cultural anthropology is dependent upon an historical knowledge of the groups whose cultures it studies. Economics would have little meaning except in the light of the history of the Industrial Revolution. Political science draws, probably more than other sciences, upon the political history of recent centuries. As noted in the previous chapter, history, like economics, has affected methods used by other social sciences, so that not only is each dependent upon the subject matter of history, but each also uses the historical method in its studies.

In turn there have been obvious recent influences from other social sciences upon history. The extent to which history has broken away from the purely political focus of attention has been due largely to the development of sociology; and the development of economics has given rise to the increasing emphasis of economic factors in the history of peoples.

Political Science

Variously called the science of government and civics, political science is, of all social sciences, the most involved in the seeming urgency of present-day problems. The very existence of government is justified by the supposition that it is an agency for the solution of problems and for the guidance of group life; therefore it is difficult to conceive of a science of government which would be detached from such considerations. Since government has its principal expression in national states, political science, like history, has been largely influenced by the nationalistic point of view; and much that has passed for political science has been ideological in nature—that is, the justification of a particular nation's government, and even the justification of a particular party or administration in that government.

This is exemplified in the recent past in the United States when it was almost a prerequisite to the serious study of government that a person first be identified as a liberal; that is, the partisan of a particular ideology. But in other nations the same general truth has prevailed—that the student of government must identify himself with an "ism" before being accepted as qualified for the undertaking.

This phenomenon is understandable when one considers that the student of government is in a position, more than are other scholars, except, perhaps the historian, to support or do irreparable harm to

particular governments. While other institutions and institutional clusters are well enough entrenched to withstand criticism, particular governments and administrations in modern times are the products of controversy, and therefore are particularly sensitive to any argumentive advantages of their opponents. It is the extreme example which throws into strong relief one of the great problems of all social sciences.

The scope of political science is as broad as that of other social sciences. It includes all of the organizations and activities involved in formal governmental machinery and, in addition, all of those organizations and activities which in any way affect government. Since governmental authority is felt, positively or negatively, in every realm of life activity, and since the politics underlying formal government is the effort to achieve equilibrium among all possible interests in a population, it follows that political science is concerned with every phase and aspect of group life.

Divisions within Political Science. The main division within political science is that between the study of the form of governments and that of the political activities which make governments function. The former study is largely deductive, that is, reasoning from principles to establish other principles. For example, if it is a principle that governments exist by consent of the governed, then it is a further principle that all people should have a voice in governmental affairs. The latter is more apt to be inductive—that is, reasoning from facts and from them trying to establish generalizations.

Another division within social science is between the theoretical and the applied phases, as in the case of economics. With the expansion of governmental activities there has been a consistent increase in the number of vocational opportunities within government. This extension has been accompanied by extension of civil service and other merit systems at the various levels, and in these some background in political science is of great advantage, both for initial appointment and later advancement in the service.

One important subdivision within political science, which in the last two decades has gained great importance, has been the field of international relations and the subordinate field of international law. As efforts have increased to establish world government and movements to abolish war have grown and become more articulate, this field has had wide popular appeal.

Relations to Other Sciences. In connection with the discussion of economics, the close relationship of that science with the science of govern-

ment was emphasized, and it is probably the closest interrelationship of political science within the fields of the sciences. It is best illustrated in the field of public finance, as previously noted, for public finance might well be considered as a branch of economics or a specialization within the field of political science.

Next in significance is the relationship between government and history. Since both are nationalistic in their orientation, largely because of the popular influences and controls over each, they have a strong affinity. The political science which strongly supports the American scheme of government is logically close to the history of the United States which also serves to support the American system. Under existing conditions this is both inevitable and highly significant for all social sciences, all of which are subject, to some extent, to the same influences.

Political science has been strongly affected recently by the findings of sociology, social psychology, and especially cultural anthropology. As the study of political activities and relationships grows, the knowledge of human nature and cultural forces which impinge upon the activities of humans becomes increasingly necessary to an understanding of the problems which arise. But as yet such influences are subordinated to those of history and economics.

Sociology

Sociology has been affected by two types of influences, both outside the realm of science, but both of which have helped to shape the present viewpoints and confusions regarding the science. One was that which was contained in Comte's blueprint for the new science, drawn a hundred years ago. It was the plan for a master social science, which would include all others and chart the way to a more rational scheme of group life. Other later sociologists have insisted upon the same general plan for the science, and thus sociology has been indelibly stamped with the idea of over-all social engineering, despite the fact that present-day sociologists are willing to accept a much humbler role as specialized social scientists. The other influence has been that of traditional philanthropy, which has seized upon sociology as a supposed instrument for effecting its purposes. The latter influence has given to sociology its lush growth of applied fields—criminology, social work, family counseling, social legislation, etc. These have tended to emphasize, as in the case of political science, the urgency of problems to be solved.

The scope of sociology is as broad as is that of other social sciences, including all of the phenomena of human group life. There is no social science which has as obviously invaded all of the areas of human life

as has sociology, and this is probably due to the relatively recent development of sociology as a distinct science.

Divisions within Sociology. The principal division within sociology at present is that between the theoretical and the applied phases of the science. Because the field is rich and vocationally wide, the applied phases appear to be dominant. In spite of this, among the theoretical fields sociology is now the most virile, with the possible exception of social psychology. Theoretical sociology shares with cultural anthropology the position of challenging accepted notions. Both are critical of the ethnocentric position of current nationalism, or the idea that what is true of one's nationalistic culture is necessarily the normal, natural, and right. Here the theoretical and practical divisions within the field are widely apart because, in practical sociology, the current cultural and national standards are usually accepted as a working basis.

Relations to Other Sciences. Most social science fields have strongly affected the applied phases of sociology. Since most social welfare programs are now governmental, and since most social reform programs are political, political science has been more influential than other sciences. It could be said, with justification, that social work is more nearly an application of political science than it is of sociology, despite the fact that "social work" sounds more like sociology than it does like political science.

Theoretical sociology is more closely related to cultural anthropology than to any other social science. Both are preoccupied with the influence of culture upon human behavior. Its next affinity is with history, since its emphasis upon tradition is in keeping with the notion of historical continuity.

Social Psychology

Whether there is a science of social psychology is debatable. In this book it has been assumed that there is such a science, but it is also tenable that social psychology is a branch of psychology, or a branch of sociology. The key to the situation lies in the fact that both fields have equal claim to social psychology, emphasizing the importance of the debated middle ground between the two. Neither sociology nor psychology has been able to occupy satisfactorily that middle ground.

The science of social psychology is torn in two parts and has yet to reconcile them into one system of theory. One part is that which reflects the sociological or group approach to the study and understanding of human behavior; the other, that which places stress upon the individualistic and psychological approach. There is much to be said for both

interpretations, and it is impossible at present to make a definite decision as between the two. Most of the social psychologists have attempted to bridge the gap, but none has done it satisfactorily from a scientific standpoint.

If we accept that social psychology is a science in its own right, we must recognize that it is the newest of all social sciences, and therefore the least mature. That fact serves to explain both the chaotic situation as regards its basic assumptions and its vitality in striking out into hitherto unexplored fields of human behavior and thought.

Divisions within the Science. There are few divisions within social psychology which are clearly distinguishable. Probably the major division which has pertinence for the present stage of development is that between the study of personality, its genesis and development, and that of collective behavior, or socio-psychological patterns of group activities.

Relations with Other Sciences. Throughout the history of the development of the social sciences there has been a constant lament on the part of those who specialized in them that there was no adequate psychology for their needs. Social psychology arose largely from that long realized need, and thus its relationship to other social sciences is obvious. Its findings and generalizations, as far as they are accepted by other scientists, are basic to every other social science, more especially to sociology, political science, psychology, and cultural anthropology.

The fact is that most of the findings of social psychology are still in a state of suspension and are not wholly acceptable to other disciplines. Those that come from the part of social psychology which is largely influenced by sociology find ready acceptance in sociology and cultural anthropology, but not in other social sciences. Those that stem from the social psychology which is mainly the product of psychologists is more readily acceptable to political scientists and economists.

Some Basic Differences

What has been said of each of the social sciences has prepared the ground for noting what the basic differences among them are. Every science, whose problems demand an understanding of human nature, must have some assumptions regarding human nature, since we have no indisputable factual definitions of the term. There are two possible assumptions, with variations of each. One may consider that human nature is inborn, chiefly, and only to a small extent influenced by life experience. The other is that human nature is entirely, or nearly so, a product of life experiences.

The former assumption is that which is most compatible with the individualistic approach; and, since our culture emphasizes individualism, it has high prestige in our cultural patterns of thought. The other assumption—that human nature is a cultural product—however, has gained rapidly among scientists recently because it appears to have the strongest support from verifiable observation.

Economics, history, and political science have used the individualistic approach, traditionally. Cultural anthropology and sociology have been based mainly on the group approach. Social psychology, as previously noted, has been torn between the two. From the individualistic approach it is assumed that what a person does, thinks, and feels can best be explained in terms of the person himself; the group approach is based on the idea that what each individual does, thinks, and feels can better be explained in terms of events and facts external to the person.

Applied to the familiar classroom situations, this distinction means that the presence of each student may be explained either in terms of the individual himself, his innate capacities, peculiar traits, and thought processes, or in terms of what is external to the individual—that is, custom, tradition, rules, and group standards. The individual and the group approach both recognize the validity of the other, but the emphasis is of paramount importance when it comes to interpretation of particular cases.

Summary

Although there is a basic unity in the social sciences, there also are differences which account for the development of several instead of one social science. It is partly by accident, and partly because of the complexity of their subject matter that several sciences seem necessary. The trend, as with all occupational fields, is toward greater specialization and, therefore, a multiplication of the specialized sub-fields within the social sciences.

Each of the social sciences has its own characteristics. Economics, the most mature, has subjected its data more to mathematical devices than others. Social psychology, the newest, is still torn between individualistic and group approaches to its problems. History, oldest of the separate disciplines, has failed to develop scientific maturity largely because it is so well understood by people generally that it has been subordinated largely to their ideologies.

Under all the more superficial differences among the social sciences lies the basic differences between the individualistic and group approaches. Because ours is a culture which places stress upon individualism, the social sciences which use the individualistic approach have greater prestige; but scientific evidence, as it accumulates, appears to

lie mainly on the side of sociology and cultural anthropology, which interpret their data principally in terms of such group phenomena as tradition and culture.

Terms

Individualistic approach
Group approach
Archaeology
Empirical
Social engineering
Public finance
Economics
Political science
Anthropology
Sociology
History
Social Psychology

Questions

1. Why are there several social sciences instead of one?
2. Which is the most mature, scientifically, of the social sciences? Explain.
3. What are some close affinities among the social sciences?
4. Which of the social sciences is most under the control of popular opinion? Why?
5. What is meant by the individualistic approach?
6. How does the individualistic approach differ from the group approach?

READING LIST

Charles A. Beard, *The Nature of the Social Sciences*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
Lester V. Chandler, *A Preface to Economics*. Harper & Bros., 1947.
R. G. Gettell, *Introduction to Political Science*. Ginn & Co., 1910.
Richard T. LaPiere, *Sociology*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1946.
Kimball Young, *Social Psychology*. Crofts, 1930.
Clark Wissler, *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*. Henry Holt & Co., 1939.

CHAPTER XXIV

Social Science and Social Policy

This book began with some inquiry into the expectations and realities regarding the social sciences and their role in ushering in a better world. It will now close with further discussion of the same problems in the light of what has been revealed in the intervening chapters. It may be agreed generally that the justification of the existence of the social sciences must lie in the contributions which they make, directly or indirectly, immediately or in the remote future, to human welfare, just as that is the ultimate reason for any science. This general agreement, however, leaves much room for disagreement among social scientists and others as to how directly they should be concerned with immediate solutions for pressing problems of the day or with their contributions to social policy.

A few social scientists and many laymen are insistent that, regardless of the relative immaturity of the social sciences, they should take greater responsibility here and now for the direction of human affairs, reasoning that the "crises" of the times are such that any delay may well mean the disastrous end of Western Civilization, if not of all humanity. If this is true (and the perspective of history argues against it), the social sciences have probably arrived too late to do humankind much good. The development of a science is a matter of generations and centuries, not of days and hours.

What has been true of all sciences—that they must first learn to walk before they can run—is more especially true of social sciences because of the special obstacles to rapid development with which they are confronted, and which have been so fully treated in this book that repetition is not necessary at this point.

The Idea of Progress

Western Civilization has not been the originator of science or scientific method, but the systematic and rapid growth of the sciences has been peculiar to it. This is equally true of the idea of progress, which, as we now accept it, is peculiar to our own civilization and to the last few centuries of its development. Both science and the idea of progress

have, in turn, greatly affected the kind and direction of development of Western Civilization. Science and the idea of progress have strongly supported each other, for it has been the advances of physical sciences and their dependent technologies which have given strong impetus to the idea of progress, just as the notion of progress has given strong support to scientific development. Despite their close interrelationship, the evolution of science and the idea of progress have been quite different. Science has advanced largely by developing methods and by critical self-correction, whereas the notion of progress has developed as a number of ideologies and has shunned critical self-examination. This does not mean that there is no reality behind the idea of progress, but simply that its reality has never been rigidly separated from the dream.

The notion of progress, if the term is used to mean a consistent movement of mankind toward a life which is better in all ways for everyone, is based upon faith and not upon factual analysis. Indeed, those who have put the faith to the test of factual study have usually arrived at the disquieting conclusion that progress is an illusion, or that decline and decay are as certain in human life as is progress. Nevertheless, the idea of progress is so much a part of our culture that we who live our lives out in it find its acceptance an indispensable part of our cultural adjustment.

Progress Versus Change. The critical viewpoint of social scientists toward the idea of progress is shown in their preference for the term "social change" to describe what others describe as "progress," for change can be recognized as a demonstrable fact. Change, however, is in no necessary direction and is toward no goal or set of goals. Change is a contributing cause of social problems, as this book has repeatedly illustrated, even though it may also at times bring alleviation and even solutions for problems.

Where the idea of progress is admitted into social sciences, it is with reference to limited progress toward definable goals. An example would be the undoubted progress in lengthening human life expectancy. But prolonged life expectancy, as this book has shown, has brought with it a number of difficult problems for humanity and particular groups notably in the difficulties of adequately caring for increasing numbers of aged people and the diseases, physical and mental, which fall with heavy incidence upon the old. It also brings problems of differentials among racial and national groups in the rate of changes in their age-groups compositions. Other examples could readily be given to show that limited and definable progress may mean new difficulties as well as seeming solution for old ones.

Progress and Panaceas. Most of the Utopian notions of progress are closely linked with particular supposed panaceas, or cure-alls, for human ills. This tends to give to such ideologies particularistic emphasis that is contrary to the increasing tendency of social sciences to deal in multiple-causation and to stress the complexity and the wholeness of human life. Much of the current impatience with social sciences may be laid to the fact that the social scientist, trying to see his problem in its entirety, often makes it seem much more difficult than it appears to advocates of reforms who look upon life from a narrower viewpoint.

Since the beginning of our national history, the American people have tended to think of democracy as in itself a cure for all the world's ills.[1] As this book has shown, democracy not only cures and alleviates problems, but it also creates new ones and aggravates some old ones. There is wide disparity between the abstract ideal of democracy and democracy in practice, and as yet no democracy has been developed that is not beset with social problems. Socialism, as a rival ideology, has even less to show in demonstrated fact to support the claims of its advocates that it is a panacea. In addition to presenting the same differences between ideal and reality that democracy shows, socialism presents the difficulty that it is still largely experimental, as witness recent governmental troubles in England. Neither democracy nor socialism, nor any other political or economic ideology, has yet made a scientifically impressive case that it can cure all human ills.

Thinking back to some of the other panaceas previously mentioned in this book, it is clear that all fall short of what truthfully might be advocated by the scientifically minded as certain remedies for the problems of human group life. There are education, new and more rigid laws, the single tax, and eugenics, to name but a few. Each can present a seemingly convincing case that it is the answer to our problems, yet they conflict among themselves to the extent that in combination they offer as much confusion as faces the social sciences.

Ends and Means

To a greater extent than other scientists, the social scientist is handicapped by lack of general agreement upon the ends which are to be served by his contributions. He is able to contribute means by which some human ends can be reached, but the decision as to ends is one for the moralist and not for the scientist. The confusions of the present world are largely those of conflicting ends and not those arising from lack of means. A part of the problem of ends is that of the "price"

[1] T. S. Harding, "The Place of Science in Democratic Government," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XII, 1947, pp. 621-626.

which we are willing to pay to achieve them. Here again we are outside the realm of the social scientist who may help to add up the bill but who cannot say that it is too small or too large, except when he steps from his role of scientist and turns moralist.

Those who say that human nature is stubborn, and that no amount of knowledge can enable us to change it, are confronted by the impressive evidence of whole nations of people—Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia—who in a single generation became thoroughly indoctrinated into radically new ways of life. We have had the opportunity to study the methods and results of these great experiments carefully, and our doubts are not as to whether it can be done or how, but as to whether it is worth the "price." It requires, of course, "regimentation," the wholesale "liquidation" of opposition, the intensive propagation (and this for scientists is important) of unscientific ideologies beginning at the cradle and concentrating upon the very young. The means are known. Is it worth the "price"? The moralist must answer.

Social Science and War. In the perspective of history, it is possible that more important than who won the Second World War will eventually be the fact that in that war, for the first time, social sciences, to an impressive extent, were harnessed to war purposes. Popular attention has been focused upon the fact that the exigencies of war forced the use of atomic fission for war purposes, but to social scientists it is equally important that they made necessary the first mobilization of social science for war purposes. The mobilization was without a clear guiding pattern, incomplete and hesitant, but the effectiveness of the knowledge which was focused upon particular problems of strategy and tactics was such that, in a possible future World War, we may well expect the social sciences to play a part somewhat comparable to that of the physical sciences.

The problem of mobilizing whole nations for total war was largely one which fell into the realm of social science. The effort was often confused and bungling, yet no one can doubt that it was done effectively. Colleges and universities were drained of their best social scientists to man governmental bureaus and agencies, as well as to serve as advisers for the armed forces. When alien lands were to be invaded and occupied, social scientists were called to help chart the courses; and although their advice was often ignored, when accepted it played an important part in the success of particular operations.

These wartime revelations are reminiscent of the many which have been made in the same and previous wars regarding physical sciences, which under war conditions showed surprising ability to solve problems which had plagued men for decades and centuries.

Significance for Peace. The somewhat superficial logical assumption of many who have evaluated the contributions of social sciences to the solution of wartime problems has been that it should be a relatively simple matter for them to make contributions on the same scale during peace. What is overlooked in such logic is the fact that wars, by their very nature, largely eliminate the questions of ends, which are so difficult in the absence of war. In wars, nations have one end above all others, and that is to win the war; and anything which will contribute to that one end may be accepted without further justification. The obstacles to innovations which are normal in group life are considerably diminished. People bent upon winning a war are quite prepared to accept "regimentation."

While it is true that, more and more, application of social sciences to limited peacetime problems is taking place with each decade, this development will be much slower, the scope will be greatly reduced, and the differences of opinion regarding specific ends will continue.

It is probable that for a long time to come the main contributions of social sciences in the field of public policies will be negative rather than positive, in the sense of showing what cannot be done rather than of showing what can be done. Many of man's Utopian dreams are of the nature of "eating one's cake, and having it too"; and often it has been, and will continue to be, the function of those who emphasize facts to point out that a choice must be made.

Social Planning

Scientific social planning has been a growing field in recent times. Outstanding examples have been such over-all plans as have been undertaken with varying success in some European countries: Germany under the Nazi regime, Soviet Russia, and England. In the United States we are more accustomed to a fragmentary approach to governmental planning, with a number of separate long-range plans presented in various fields, such as the conservation of resources, the development of metropolitan areas, and recreational planning.

Where clearly marked objectives have been agreed upon,[2] such planning has achieved measurable results; but, since the planning is fragmentary, often there are conflicts among different plans. This emphasizes the fact that the carrying out of plans involves "costs." World planning may encounter an obstacle in national planning of various nations; and national planning may run counter to local and regional plans. A

[2] Carl C. Taylor, "The Sociologists' Part in Planning the Columbia River Basin," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XI, 1946, pp. 321-330; discussion by Marion Clawson, *ibid.*, pp. 330-332.

planned economy may be had only at the expense of some phases of free enterprise.

The Planning Movement. There is a considerable literature which has grown out of the planning movement, especially in this country. There is a generally recognized approach to planning that has been set forth by one author in the following steps: [3]

1. The determination of objectives to be sought.
2. Research to understand the problem.
3. The discovery of alternative solutions.
4. Policy making—choosing between alternatives, including the frequent choice of doing nothing.
5. The detailed execution of the chosen alternative.

A planning program thus outlined involves, especially in the second and third steps, the use of social science techniques; but the first and fourth steps are mainly outside the realm of social sciences, since they are matters of values sought and willingness to pay "prices." Although social science findings may help in such evaluations, they are not the principal elements in most cases.

Time Element. Usually the findings of social sciences indicate that the effective carrying out of social policy means the allowance of considerable periods of time for lasting achievement. The most fundamental social policies, calling for considerable change in existing social arrangements, involve slow and gradual change, not only of the relationships within society, but also a reflected change in the attitudes of many persons. If such changes of attitude are basic, they probably require training of whole generations in new points of view. Where public policy is a matter of delicate balance among many varying interests, the policies themselves often change before any one of them can be carried through consistently to a stage of lasting results. No matter how well means are understood and applied, no amount of scientific knowledge can accomplish much if the ends are fluctuating rapidly.

Some Dangers

Recent developments have brought some doubt as to the desirability of rapid and unguided advances in natural sciences and their dependent technologies. It has long been noted by social scientists that no development in science or technology is necessarily for the betterment of man-

[3] George B. Galloway and Associates, *Planning for America,* Henry Holt & Co., 1941, p. 6.

kind, and many innovations have created more problems for humanity than they have solved. This is truer in the social sciences than in the natural sciences, and especially in looking forward to future possible social science developments. The advancement of science is the systematic and progressive substitution of factual knowledge for uncritical belief, and man's faiths are largely matters of belief. The dependable and predictable in human life rest largely upon widely accepted fictions which are wholly or partly untrue, as often pointed out in this book. What social science already has to offer in well-substantiated scientific truths, if immediately and widely accepted to replace beliefs, might be more disruptive of group life than otherwise, to say nothing of possible damage to individual morale.

Very few people, even in this country, have any real appreciation of the facts of social science, of the evidence upon which those facts are based, or of the implications of those facts for their most cherished beliefs. If we may accept the notion of many social scientists that these disciplines are on the threshold of even greater discoveries, it is disturbing to realize that each will probably challenge dearly held notions of many people.[4]

Social Policy

In its usual usage the term "social policy" refers to long-range programs which are justified primarily in terms of general welfare. This definition is broad, as it must be to include all to which the term is currently applied. It would be difficult, in logic, to justify a narrower meaning which many hold: that a policy to be *social* must be detrimental and painful to some presently privileged groups; for, although such a result might be an effect of a social policy, it should not be included as a necessary qualification. The feelings that it is necessary to make the rich poorer, or those of high status lowlier, while ideologically advocated in some quarters, are not necessary features of a social policy.

Those social policies which advocate a sudden launching into schemes for which there are no precedents, and which inevitably imply much trial and error at the sacrifice of all that is stable, certain, and predictable, are considered as "visionary" and have little prospect of sufficient acceptance to make them effective. They can, and often do, have logical support, but they cannot have scientific validity for the simple reason that there are no facts by which they may be judged.

The social policies which become effective are those which advocate something for which there is support in knowable human experience.

[4] Albert Morris, "Can We Survive a Science of Society?" *Education*, April, 1946.

They fall into two classes—the alleviative and the preventive. Those which are most frequently enacted into law are alleviative and are designed to bring about some relief for difficult and pressing problems with the least violence to the general scheme of things. The preventive are more sweeping and, while logically having strong justification in many cases, they are much less likely to become effective because they do, to some extent, involve wide-scale social experimentation without assurance that they will succeed.[5]

There are numerous examples of alleviative policies, and in them social sciences may be largely useful because they usually lie within the realm of the factual and the predictable. Where preventive programs are concerned, it is probable that social sciences will make their next important contributions, although at present their offerings are meager. Whether in the alleviative or the preventive realm, the problem is always complicated by the inevitable disparities between the ideal and the real. An illustration could be drawn from medical science. In the case of a simple cold, it is a comparatively simple problem for the medical man to alleviate the immediate distress. When it comes to preventing recurrence of the cold, he is faced with a more complex problem, in which his devices are less certain. If asked for a panacea, or cure-all, for colds he has no answer to give. Similarly, those who are engaged in applying social sciences can find palliatives for most of the pressing, immediate problems, and can prescribe efficiently to that extent. If the problem is one of prevention of recurrence of the difficulty, it is much more complex, and answers are less certain. The parallel holds, even though medical science is older and better established than are any of the social sciences.

Anthropologists have been asked, "How can we lessen the cultural conflicts involved in an American occupation of Japan?" And they have given dependable answers. The further question of how we might prevent recurrence of cultural misunderstandings between Americans and the Japanese finds them less sure. Asked for a panacea to cultural conflict, they have nothing convincing to offer.

Sociologists might be asked to give guides for lessening rates of juvenile delinquency in a particular area, and, in all probability, they could give dependable prescriptions. If asked to present a program for prevention of recurrence of high delinquency rates in the area, they are less certain; and in programs for the elimination of juvenile delinquency they have nothing to offer that gives assurance of success.

Much the same may be said of all the social sciences: the more

[5] Florian Znaniecki, "Sociological Ignorance and Social Planning," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. XXX, 1945, pp. 87-100.

limited the problem, the more certain policy guides they are prepared to offer. Conversely, for the larger problems, the sciences have the least to offer, even though the seeming need for answers is greater. With the passage of time it may be predicted that social sciences will extend the range of their help to social policy, but patience is a necessary quality of social scientists.

Summary

This chapter has been designed to draw together what has been more fully discussed in earlier chapters. It repeats that the basis of social problems is the inevitable conflict between the need for social change and the need for social stability, which is expressed in resistance to change.

Social policy is effective, mainly, when it aims at alleviating pressing ills for the moment, less so in the field of prevention of recurrence of these ills, and least when it aims at Utopian reform. This is consistent with the development of social sciences as guides to policy: for social science has most to offer in the realm of the limited and immediate, which is the palliative; least in the realm of the remote and uncharted, which is the Utopian.

Social policy must deal in both ends and means. The social scientist, as long as he remains a scientist, can only help in the matter of means, because the ends of human activity are necessarily decided on moral, not scientific, grounds. So long as ends are variously stated and in constant fluctuation, the contribution which science can make to means must remain relatively unimpressive.

Terms

Progress
Change
Utopian
Exigency
Fragmentary
Planning movement
Policy
Beliefs
"Visionary"
Alleviative
Palliative
Remedial
Preventive
Disruptive

Questions

1. The idea of progress is a group of ideologies. Discuss.
2. Why does the social scientist prefer the term "change" to "progress"?
3. Is the determination of social ends a task for the social scientist? Explain.
4. Why does war bring out the potentialities of social science better than does peace?
5. What steps are involved in social planning?
6. What dangers might be involved in rapid spread of the truths of social science?

READING LIST

J. D. Bury, *The Idea of Progress.* The Macmillan Co., London, 1921.
C. M. Case, *Social Process and Human Progress.* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1931.
A. A. Ekirch, Jr., *The Idea of Progress in America.* Columbia University Press, 1944.
George B. Galloway, and Associates, *Planning for America.* Henry Holt & Co., 1941.
Paul H. Landis, *Social Policies in the Making.* D. C. Heath Co., 1947.
Ralph Linton, *The Science of Man in a World of Crisis.* Columbia University Press, 1945.
Lewis L. Lorwin, *Time for Planning.* Harper & Bros., 1945.
Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge for What?* Princeton University Press, 1939.
George A. Lundberg, *Can Science Save Us?* Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.

Index of Authors

Adams, James Truslow, 31
Albig, W., 266
Alexander, Franz, 277
Almack, R. B., 286n.
Amidon, Beulah, 292
Anderson, Harold H., 175
Andrews, John N., 221
Angell, Robert C., 15
Aristotle, 6
Arnold, T. W., 192, 236

Ballard, I. V., 42
Barnes, Harry Elmer, 31, 42, 106n., 117, 319
Bartlett, F. C., 266
Barzun, J. M., 292
Bates, Sanford, 117
Beard, Chas. A., 31, 319, 333
Beard, Mary R., 31
Bell, E. H., 224n.
Benedek, Therese, 175
Benedict, Ruth, 42, 91n., 101
Bennett, J. L., 281n.
Benoit-Smullyan, E., 164n.
Bentham, Jeremiah, 7
Bently, A. F., 307, 313n.
Benton, William B., 192, 208
Berelson, B., 266
Bernard, L. L., 72, 236, 305n.
Bernays, Edward L., 261n.
Beveridge, Sir William, 85
Binger, Carl, 144
Bisbee, Eleanor, 296n.
Blakey, C. Gladys, 214n., 221
Blakey, Roy G., 214n., 221
Blodgett, Ralph H., 186n.
Bonar, James, 7n.
Borchard, Edwin H., 117
Bossard, J. H. S., 15
Bridgeman, P. W., 307
Brockaway, Thomas, 72
Brown, F. J., 72
Bryan, Lt. Commander J. III, 64n.
Buck, A. E., 221
Burgess, E. W., 131, 301n.
Burns, A. R., 192
Bury, J. D., 40n., 42, 343

Cantril, Hadley, 277
Cargill, Oscar, 32
Carr, Lowell J., 117
Carr-Saunders, A. M., 19n.
Case, C. M., 343
Cayton, H. R., 153n.
Chamberlain, Houston, 93
Chandler, Lester V., 192, 333
Chase, Stuart, 266, 307
Childs, H. L., 263n., 266
Clapham, J. H., 57
Clare, L. A., 268n.
Clark, Harold F., 279n.
Clawson, Marion, 338n.
Cleckley, Harvey, 169n.
Cobb, J. C., 316n
Cohen, M. R., 236
Cook, L. A., 286n.
Cooley, Charles Horton, 107
Coon, C. S., 101
Copeland, L. C., 269n.
Cordozo, B. J., 237
Cottrell, L. S., Jr., 31, 165n., 301n.
Crawford, Kenneth G., 254
Crooks, W. H., 208
Crosser, Paul K., 270n.
Crowther, G., 221

Dalton, H., 221
Darwin, Charles, 7
Davis, A., 164n.
Davis, Emily C., 47n., 57
Davis, M. M., 134
Dewey, D. R., 221
Dewey, John, 292, 307
Dixon, R. A., 192
Dollard, John 40n.
Doob, Leonard W., 266
Douglas, Paul H., 82n.
Dowd, Jerome, 42
Doyle, Bertram W., 42
Drake, S., 153n.

Edwards, Newton, 292
Ekirch, A. A., Jr., 343
Elmer, M. C., 175, 319

Farnsworth, Paul, 104n., 163n.
Folsom, James K., 32, 131
Foster, J. E., 262n.
Frampton, M. E., 131
Frazier, E. Franklin, 125n., 131
Fry, Vivian, 72

Galloway, George B., 339n., 343
Garth, Thomas, 101
Gaudet, H., 266
Gesell, Arnold, 175
Gettell, R. G., 333
Giddings, F. H., 227n.
Gill, N. N., 254
Gillin, John L., 74n., 106n., 117
Glueck, Eleanor, 117, 315n.
Glueck, Sheldon, 117, 315n.
Gobineau, de, Count, 91n., 101
Goldenweiser, Alexander, 319
Goldman, F., 144
Goodsell, W., 123n.
Goring, Charles, 104n.
Goshell, H. F., 254
Greenhoe, F., 286n.
Griffin, J. L., 208
Griffith, E. S., 231n., 254
Groves, E. R., 131

Hackett, John A., 319
Halsey, Admiral William, 64n.
Harding, T. S., 336n.
Hardy, C. O., 218n.
Harris, Seymour, 221
Hart, Ella B., 131
Hart, Hornell, 131, 301n.
Hayes, C. E., 319
Herman, E., 277
Herring, Pendleton, 231n.
Herskovitz, K. J., 101
Hertzler, J. O., 240n.
Hewett, Edgar L., 47n.
Hiller, E. T., 208
Hobbes, Thomas, 36n.
Hobhouse, L. T., 42
Hobson, J. A., 57, 319
Hodges, Charles, 72
Hollingshead, A. B., 223n.
Horn, Stanley F., 246n.
Horney, Karen, 144
House, F. N., 319
Howells, W. W., 57
Hoxie, Robert T., 199n., 208
Hughes, E. C., 42
Hutchins, R. M., 312n.

Ilg, Frances L., 175

Jocher, Katherine, 319
Jones, Alfred Winslow, 42

Kaplan, Oscar J., 175
Kirkheimer, Otto, 117
Klineberg, Otto, 91n., 92n., 101
Knode, J. C., 15, 292
Knowles, I. C. A., 57
Kohn, H., 237
Korzybski, Alfred, 307

Lambert, E. M., 42
Landis, C., 144
Landis, Paul H., 161, 237, 343
LaPiere, Richard T., 37n., 43, 104n., 163n. 261n., 268n., 277, 333
Lasswell, H. D., 254
Lavine, Harold, 262n.
Lazarfeld, P. F., 266
Leevy, J. Roy, 161
Leighton, Alexander H., 278
Lemert, E. M., 223n.
Lerner, Max, 278
Levy-Bruhl, L., 268n
Linton, Ralph, 43, 101, 343
Lippman, Walter, 257n., 266
Locke, A., 101
Locke, H. J., 139n.
Locke, John, 36n.
Lombroso, Cesare, 103 f., 114
Lorwin, Lewis L., 343
Lowell, A. L., 72
Lumley, Frederick E., 266
Lundberg, George A., 15, 304n., 343
Lunden, Walter A., 169n.
Lundholm, H., 278
Lynd, Helen M., 32, 43, 161, 309n.
Lynd, Robert S., 32, 43, 161, 309n., 343

MacCurdy, G. C., 57
MacDougall, William, 305n.
MacIver, R. M., 15, 17n., 72, 278
McLaughlin, I. C., 311n.
Magoffin, R. V. D., 47n., 57
Malinowski, B., 222n.
Malthus, Thomas R., 7, 14, 15
Mannheim, Karl, 278
May, Mark A., 72
Mead, Margaret, 34, 121n.
Meadows, Paul, 274n.
Mecklin, John M., 246n.
Merriam, C. E., 254
Michels, Rudolf K., 221
Mickey, Carl B., 26n.
Mills, T. C., 192
Moley, Raymond, 117
Mombert, P., 83n.
Moore, W. E., 208
Morgan, A. E., 156n.
Morris, Albert, 340n.
Moulton, H. G., 299n.
Mowrer, H. R., 131, 175
Mumford, Lewis, 161, 278

Murphy, Gardner, 175
Myrdal, Gunnar, 101

NIMKOFF, MEYER F., 77n., 131
Neumann, Sigmund, 275n.

ODEGARD, PETER, 254
Odum, Howard W., 15, 101, 319
Ogburn, William F., 32, 161, 319
Oppenheimer, J. John, 15
Orlansky, H., 168n.
Osborne, Henry F., 57

PAGE, J. D., 144, 175
Park, Robert E., 43, 310n.
Parsons, Talcott, 307
Patterson, S. H., 208
Paustian, Paul W., 15
Peel, R. V., 254
Perlman, Selig, 208
Peters, Clarence A., 144
Petrie, W. M. F., 57
Pettinger, B. F., 282n., 292
Plant, James S., 43
Pound, Roscoe, 117, 237
Powdermaker, Hortense, 101
Powers, E., 57

RATCHFORD, B. V., 221
Ratner, Sidney, 221
Reavis, W. C., 292
Reuter, Edward B., 19n., 101, 175
Riegel, O. W., 266
Robinson, James Harvey, 307
Robinson, Thomas H., 15
Rosen, S. M., 254
Roucek, Joseph S., 38n., 72, 171n., 237, 240n., 254, 258n., 286n., 292
Rousseau, J. J., 36n.

SALTER, J. T., 254
Sanderson, Dwight, 158n.
Schroedinger, E., 307
Schultz, W. J., 221
Segerist, Henry E., 144
Sellin, J. Thorstein, 117
Seyfert, Warren C., 280n.
Shaw, Clifford, 105n., 109n.
Sikes, H., 208
Small, A. W., 313n.
Smith, Adam, 7
Smith, Reginald H., 117
Smith, T. Lynn, 161
Smith, T. V., 224n.
Sorokin, Pitirim, 61n., 65n., 72, 161
Stern, B. J., 101, 119n., 131, 144
Stewart, Maxwell, 187n.
Sumner, William Graham, 33, 34n., 69
Sutherland, R. H., 117

TAFT, DONALD R., 102n.
Taft, Philip, 208
Tanenbaum, Samuel, 280n.
Tarde, Gabriel, 104
Taussig, Frank W., 221
Taylor, Carl C., 338n.
Teeters, Negley K., 106n., 117
Thompson, Warren S., 7n., 20n., 22n., 23n., 128n., 151n.
Thorndike, E. L., 77n.
Toynbee, Arnold J., 57

VAGTS, ALFRED, 72
Valentine, P. F., 286n., 292
Veblen, Thorstein, 307
Vernier, C. G., 125n.

WALKER, E. R., 192
Waller, Willard, 69n., 131, 269n., 292
Walter, Paul, Jr., 15, 72, 171n., 258n.
Waples, D., 257n.
Ware, Norman J., 208
Wechsler, James, 262n.
Weinberg, S. K., 169n.
Westermarck, E., 120n.
Williams, J. H., 218n.
Willoughby, W. F., 237
Winston, Sanford, 43
Wirth, L., 161
Wissler, Clark, 333
Wittke, Carl, 30n., 98n., 101
Wolfers, Arnold, 72
Wright, Quincy, 72

YOUNG, KIMBALL, 338

ZIMMERMAN, C. C., 131, 161
Znaniecki, Florian, 341n.
Zorbaugh, Harvey W., 150n.
Zuker, A. J., 266

Index of Subjects

ABSTRACTION, 299, 324, 326
Accommodation, 96 ff.
Accrediting agencies, 290
Acculturation, 30, 86, 96
Adaptation, 89
Adjustment, 129, 142, 153 f., 162, 166f., 171
Administration, 231 f.
Administrators, 232 f.
Adolescence, 106, 120, 165, 173 f., 316
Adoption, 121
Advertising, 180, 188 f., 195
Africa, 26, 50, 74, 88, 146
Age groups, 69, 76, 80, 106, 115, 118 f., 127, 132 ff., 139 ff., 144, 257, 335
Agriculture, 52 f., 76, 123 f., 154 ff., 191, 246
Agricultural revolution, 53
Ainus, 90
Alcoholism, 108, 115, 139 f.
Alexander the Great, 48
Aliens, 100, 102, 152 f., 337
Alleviation, 79, 86
Alliances, 119
Alpine sub-race, 89
Amalgamation, 98 ff.
Ambitions, 166 f.
Ambivalence, 159, 279, 281, 286
Amendments, 228 f.
America, 50, 52, 98 f., 123 ff., 201 f.
American culture, 33
American Federation of Labor, 199 ff., 207
Americanism, 282
American Journal of Sociology, 15, 70n., 86n.
Americans, 94, 133
Americanization, 99 f.
American Labor Party, 248
American Revolution, 275
Anarchists, 271
Ancestor worship, 122
Andean highlands, 47
Anglo-Saxon, 109
Anthropoids, 89
Anthropology, 3 ff., 71, 119 ff., 280, 308, 310 f., 314, 322-333
  cultural, 5, 300 f., 322
  physical, 5, 88, 322
  social, 5
Anxieties, 143
Arabia, 30
Arbitration, 204 f.
Archaeology, 5, 47, 322
Architecture, 321
Archives, 56
Area studies, 311
Argentina, 146
Aristocracy, 225 ff.
Aristotle, 49 f., 312
Arizona, 154
Armed forces, 142, 169, 204 f.
Arnold, Thurmond, 317
Art, 48, 257
Arts, 94, 322
Aryan "myth," 91n., 93, 141, 273
Asia, 21, 26, 47 ff., 88, 146, 220
Assessment, 212
Assimilation, 86, 95 ff., 152 f.
Association, 104 ff., 113, 116
  differential, 112
Atavism, 103
Athens, 48, 312
Atomic bomb, 141
Atomic energy, 27, 55
Attitudes, 29, 77, 99 f., 102 ff., 106 ff., 113 ff., 118 ff., 126, 165, 172, 279, 281, 286 f., 339
Australia, 91, 146
Authority, 118 ff., 222 ff., 232, 305, 328
Autocracy, 225 ff.
Automobile, 152, 158, 177, 203
Aztecs, 47

BABYLON, 47, 145
Balance of power, 97, 156, 246
Bargain, 193 ff.
Barter, 120
Behavior, 102 ff., 106, 113 ff., 118 ff., 129 136, 149, 159, 162, 165, 167, 171 ff., 176, 189, 223, 255 f., 266, 274, 286 288, 302, 312, 330, 340
Belgium, 94
Belief, 41, 99 f., 102, 125, 140, 144, 280
Bereavement, 118 ff.
Betrothal, 118 ff.
Bible, 47, 50
Big business, 191
Big Four Brotherhoods, 201
Bill of Rights, 228
Biological processes, 100, 102, 114, 128 f. 139

Biological sciences, 3, 5, 297
Biological warfare, 141
Birth control, 27, 121
Birth rate, 19 f., 26, 69, 78, 121, 128, 136 ff., 149, 196
Black Belt, 148
Black list, 200
Blame, 304 f., 306
Blue laws, 232
Blighted areas, 152
Bonds, 215
Boss rule, 151 f., 219, 244
Boycott, 198 ff., 204
Boy Scouts, 164
Brazil, 146
Britain. *See* Great Britain
British Empire, 220
Broken homes, 118
Budgets, 79, 127, 130, 210 ff.
Building code, 135
Bureaucracy, 64, 66, 134, 230, 232
Bureau of Reclamation, 185
Business, 151, 159, 164, 176, 178 f., 181, 191, 202 ff., 211, 217, 220 f., 264
Business cycles, 68, 75, 79 f., 180
Business enterprise, 176, 192, 209, 255
Byzantium, 145

CABINET, 229, 231
California, 22, 75, 96
Canadians, 94, 202n.
Candidates, 243
Capital, 53, 68, 176, 181 ff., 193 ff.
Capitalism, 176, 199 ff., 269 ff., 324
Careers, 174
Cartel, 182
Case studies, 107 f., 315
Caste, 40, 47, 86, 97
Casual worker, 205
Caucuses, 251 f.
Caucasoid race, 21, 88 ff., 94, 102
Cause and effect, 17
Central America, 47
Censorship, 262
Census, 158, 313
Chamber of Commerce, 180
Charismatic leadership, 275
Charity, 73, 75, 128, 133
Checks and balances, 228 f., 235, 238 ff., 251
Chicago, 148
Childbirth, 137
Children, 76 ff., 81 f., 118-131, 132 f., 140, 149, 172 ff., 177, 195, 222, 255, 268, 284, 286, 289
Childless marriage, 124
Child welfare, 81 f.
China, 8, 26, 44, 47, 49, 74, 119, 234
Chinatown, 152
Chinese, 88 f., 96, 125
  exclusion of, 96
Chiropractry, 135
Christianity, 30, 48 ff.
Church, 50, 130, 157, 178, 215, 217
Cities, 45, 47, 53 f., 76, 98, 106, 123 ff., 137 ff., 143, 145-161, 201, 241, 245, 323
Citizen, 233
Citizenship, 99 f.
City state, 56, 145
Civics, 327
Civilization, 45-57, 61, 71, 145 ff., 223, 334
Civil Service, 243, 328
Civil War, 97, 199, 245
Class. *See* Social class
Closed shop, 199 ff.
Collective bargaining, 197 ff., 205 ff., 285
Collective behavior, 87, 168, 268, 331
College, 114, 129, 143, 158, 174, 178, 268, 282 ff., 289 f., 308, 311, 337
Colored races, 87, 106
Color line, 99 f., 100, 153
Commerce, 52 ff., 61, 67 f., 145 ff., 157
Commercial amusements, 153, 174
Committees, 251 f., 283
Common law, 230
Communal, 127
Communication, 46, 151, 256 ff.
Communism, 191, 267, 270
Community, 18, 29, 45, 52, 69, 74 ff., 104, 109 ff., 113 ff., 119 ff., 127 ff., 133 f., 146, 150, 158 ff., 167, 170, 178 f., 180 f., 188, 201, 204, 227, 256, 286, 288, 290, 309
Competition, 78, 86, 96 ff., 123 f., 130, 155, 158 f., 162, 168, 173, 176-192, 215, 255, 285
Complexes, 129
Compromise, 205, 238 ff., 241 f., 257
Comte, August, 313, 320 f., 329
Conciliation, 204 f.
Concubinage, 120, 125
Conduct, 126 ff.
Confiscation, 214, 220
Conflict, 39, 86-101, 102 ff., 106, 116, 127, 130, 134, 141, 144, 157, 162, 166, 170 f., 188 f., 201 ff., 256, 267, 269, 289
  impersonal, 41, 272 f., 295
Conformity, 35, 38, 42, 55, 104, 119, 125, 159, 166, 223 f., 287
Compromise, 282
Congeniality, 153

Congress, 110, 156, 180, 223, 227, 230, 238 ff., 246, 251
Congress of Industrial Organizations, 201 f., 207, 247
Conscience, 271
Conscription, 62
Conservatism, 34, 42, 229, 272
Constantine, Emperor, 49
Constantinople, 49, 145
Constitution, 227 f., 236, 251 f., 254, 258
Consumer, 156, 181, 184, 187 ff., 198, 201, 209, 211, 220
Contempt of court, 233
Cooling off period, 205
Cooperation, 100, 179, 223
Cooperatives, 186 ff., 191, 215
Corporations, 133, 155, 180 ff., 201 f., 210, 213 ff., 220, 232 f., 235
Corruption, 243
Counties, 152, 156, 158, 209, 217, 230
Courts, 125, 232 f.
Courtship, 118 ff.
Covert behavior, 165
Craft unions, 199 ff., 207
Credit, 80 f., 189, 209 f.
Creditor nation, 220
Credit union, 187
Crete, 48
Crime, 102-117, 140 f., 152 f., 214, 315
  rate, 69 f.
Criminal law, 108, 231
Criminology, 111, 329
Crises, 132 f.
Cro-Magnon Man, 46, 56
Crusades, 50
Cultural heritage, 42, 47
Culture, 8, 33, 41, 45 ff., 56, 86 ff., 94 ff., 103 ff., 111 ff., 118 ff., 152 ff., 162, 167, 173, 176, 191, 222, 256 f., 267 f., 280, 284, 288, 291, 301, 304, 311, 321 ff., 330, 333, 335
  borrowing, 29
  configurations, 5
  diffusion, 27 ff.
  material, 40, 78
  nonmaterial, 40
  patterns, 5, 304
Culture groups, 74, 94 ff., 98 f., 102, 118 ff., 163, 168, 172, 265, 269, 272, 281
Curative arts, 135
Currency, 216 f., 220
Custom, 29, 42, 109, 121, 159 f., 165, 197, 222 ff., 235, 268, 311
Custom duties, 213

Dark ages, 49 ff.
Death, 132
  rate, 19 f., 26, 128, 132-144
Debt, 80 f., 128, 133, 146, 151, 181 f. 215 f.
Definition of situation, 126
Democracy, 39, 49, 54 ff., 65, 183, 225 ff., 232, 238 ff., 242, 250, 263, 266, 279, 321, 336
Democrats, 240, 244
Demography, 151
Demoralization, 154
Denver, 146
Dependents, 127, 198, 215
Depersonalization, 62, 153, 188 f.
Depreciation, 195
Depression, 79, 146, 170
Deviant behavior, 103 ff., 116
Dictatorship, 65, 266, 271, 283
Diminishing returns, 214, 263
Direct tax, 211
Disablement, 61, 141 f.
Discipline, 288
Discrimination, 86, 97, 116, 152, 290
Disease, 61, 93, 132-144
Disorganization, social, 116, 118 f.
Distribution, economic, 73, 78
Diversification, 159
Dividends, 213
Division of labor, 51, 55, 120, 159, 297, 321
Division of powers, 228
Divorce, 69, 118, 130, 279
Domestic discord, 118, 127, 130, 150
Dominant groups, 103, 116, 125
Double standard, 126 ff.
Double taxation, 213
Dowry, 120
Dramatic art, 165
Drives, 126
Drug addiction, 108, 115, 139 f.

Ecology, human, 105
  of cities, 146 ff.
Economic activity, 62, 100, 115, 119, 129, 132, 143, 150, 155 ff., 176, 270, 309
Economics, 4 ff., 45, 62, 66 ff., 73 ff., 78-85, 94, 97 ff., 112, 123, 127, 130, 145 ff., 156, 173, 176-192, 193, 196, 203 ff., 210, 216, 267, 269, 308, 310, 332-333.
Economic security. *See* Social security.
Education, 55, 62, 76 f., 97, 113, 116, 119 ff., 129 f., 140, 145, 150, 156 f., 215, 217, 223, 253, 263, 279-292, 326, 336

Egypt, 30, 47 f., 56, 145
Elections, 204, 227, 239, 242, 248, 257, 261
Eminent domain, 184
Emotions, 127, 129, 166, 204, 296
Employers, 178, 198 ff., 205 ff.
Employment, 79, 173
Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 6n.
Engel's law, 76, 316
England, 44, 51, 53-57, 65, 186 f., 190, 201, 226 f., 326, 338
English people, 89, 91, 95.
Enterpriser, 54, 180 ff., 194, 219
Entrepreneur. *See* Enterpriser.
Equity law, 230
Escape, 167 ff., 171, 174
Eskimo, 88, 90
Ethics, 73, 257
Ethnic, 157, 285
  groups, 10, 21, 23, 76, 86-101, 102, 107, 116, 137, 152, 269
Ethnocentrism, 46, 92, 122, 330
Eugenics, 114 f., 140 f., 336
Europe, 26, 30, 41, 44, 48-57, 61 ff., 74, 88 ff., 93, 98, 146, 201 f., 234
Europeans, 92, 122, 125, 220
Evolution, human, 44, 46, 89, 322
  social, 44, 272, 335
Excess profits tax, 213
Excise tax, 211
Exploitation, 152, 157, 187, 226
Extralegal, 156, 226, 229, 238 ff., 251 ff., 264, 282, 310

FACTORS OF PRODUCTION, 193
Factories, 54, 56, 123, 150, 203
Family, 29, 45, 49, 53 f., 69, 74 ff., 111, 115 f., 118-131, 132 ff., 141, 145, 150, 155 ff., 162, 164, 172, 177, 184, 194, 198, 205, 215, 222, 225, 244, 249, 280, 284, 287 ff., 298, 308 ff., 327
Fanatical movements, 168, 174, 274 f.
Farms, 52 f., 78 ff., 127 f., 154 ff., 182, 193, 199
Farm problem, 156
Farm vote, 246
Fascism, 186, 270
Federal government, 81 f., 96, 128, 228
Federal Security Administration, 156
Feeblemindedness, 104, 140
Feudalism, 50 f., 56
Filipinos, 23, 95
Finance, 80 ff.
First World War, 63, 66, 97, 152
Fiscal, 210
  policy, 79
Florence, 51
Folkways, 34 ff., 38, 40, 42, 69 ff., 129 f., 268, 310
Folk wisdom, 302, 321
Foreign-born. *See* Immigrants.
Foreign policy, 234 ff.
Forest service, 185
Franchise, 184, 243
France, 19, 51, 55, 65, 89, 202, 227, 248
Freedom of the press, 258
Free enterprise, 135, 184, 187, 190 f., 193, 199 ff., 339
French people, 91, 95
French Revolution, 275 f.
Freudian theory, 162
Frontier, 96, 123, 146

GENERAL ASSEMBLY. See United Nations.
Generalization, 299 f., 305
General strike, 201
General property tax, 212 ff.
General welfare, 186, 210, 334, 340
German people, 89, 93
Germany, 19, 55, 65, 68, 114, 227
Gompers, Samuel, 199
Government, 45, 65 ff., 79 ff., 102 ff., 109, 113, 125, 128, 134, 156, 158, 162, 179 ff., 183, 187, 190 f., 200 ff., 209-221, 222-237, 263 ff., 282, 311 f.
Graeco-Roman. *See* Western Civilization.
Graft, 151 f., 219, 243
Grants-in-aid, 81 f., 252 f.
Great Britain, 49, 65, 146, 220
Great powers, 234
Greece, 30, 48 f., 51, 56, 145
Gresham's law, 300 f.
Guatamala, 94
Gulf of Mexico, 146

HABIT, 38, 104 f., 115 f., 136, 138, 144, 171, 188 f., 223, 286
Health, 132-144, 145, 188
Hegel, 271
Heredity, 76 ff., 87, 95, 100, 103, 114, 139
  social, 77, 139 ff., 225
Hierarchy, 225, 230
High school, 174, 285, 289
Highways, 148, 158
Hindu, 88
History, 4 ff., 17, 44-57, 62 ff., 70, 95, 100, 118 f., 143, 145 ff., 150 f., 169, 172, 179, 184 f., 191, 199, 212, 216, 224, 227, 229, 243, 267, 275, 280, 290 f., 308, 310 ff., 326-333, 334
Hitler, Adolf, 304
Hobbes, Thomas, 270, 320
Holding companies, 182
Hospitals, 134

Households, 81, 120, 148 f., 154
Humanities, 4, 273 f.
Human nature, 36, 71, 144, 163 f., 304, 306, 325, 329, 331, 337
Huntington, Ellsworth, 312

Ideals, 113, 124, 130, 142, 149 f., 207, 341
Ideologies, 76, 87, 124, 126, 202, 225 f., 267-278, 282, 287, 290, 298, 304, 320, 326, 332, 335
Idleness, 198, 203
Illinois, 75
Illness, 128, 132-144, 169
Immigrants, 106, 137, 149 f., 152, 199, 206
Immigration, 97 ff., 102, 244 f.
Imperialism, 54 ff., 65, 93
Incas, 47
Income, 127 f., 133, 316
  groups, 77 ff.
  tax, 213 ff.
Increment, 197
India, 26, 47, 49, 74, 88
Indians, American, 9, 21, 24, 30, 47 f., 52, 87, 90, 93 ff., 134, 269
Individualism, 51, 109, 124, 127, 150 ff., 154, 202, 330, 332
Indoctrination, 282, 298, 337
Industrialists, 64, 180
Industrial unions, 200 ff.
Industrial Workers of the World, 201
Industrial Revolution, 44, 51-57, 74, 123 f., 191, 197 ff., 324, 326
Industry, 54, 62, 67 f., 80, 138, 144, 155 f., 173, 176, 179, 186, 190 f., 200 f., 207, 214, 217, 321
Infanticide, 121
Infant mortality, 128, 136 ff.
Inflation, 61, 214
In-groups, 69, 71, 86, 92 ff., 99 f., 108
Inheritance tax, 213
Injunctions, 200, 223
Insanity, 104, 139, 162, 168
Insecurity, 172
Instinct, 124, 126, 305
Institutions, 8, 34 f., 38, 40 f., 45 f., 49, 51, 62, 66, 69 f., 73, 80, 97, 118-131, 141, 143, 149 ff., 157, 159, 162, 215, 222, 235, 240, 255, 260, 268, 279 f., 284, 287, 310, 321, 327
Insurance, 81 f., 128, 133 f., 173, 185, 189, 195, 243
Integrity, 166, 170, 188
Intelligence, 77, 104
  quotients, 140 f.
Interest, 151, 187, 193 f., 215 ff., 220
Interest groups, 258, 282
Interests, 38 ff., 62, 80, 86, 156, 176, 179, 188, 199, 203, 328, 339
Interior, Secretary of, 212
Intermarriage, 99 f.
International, 203
  court, 66
  government, 235 f.
  law, 235, 328
  relations, 211, 310, 328
  unions, 202n.
Internationalism, 67
Intolerance, 97 ff.
Inventions, 27
Invisible government, 238-254, 257
Irish people, 95
"Iron law" of wages, 195, 205
Isolation, 29, 138, 145, 153, 155, 170, 299, 305
Isolationism, 234
Italy, 49, 51, 103, 227

Japan, 55, 96, 234, 341
Jefferson, Thomas, 247
Jews, 23, 92 ff., 141
Judicial review, 228
Jurisdiction, 210, 232 f.
Jurisprudence, 314
Jury trial, 109, 232
Justice, 113
Juvenile delinquency, 70, 102-117, 129 f., 287, 298, 341

Kansas City, 146
Kinship, 125

Labor, 54, 79 ff., 96 ff., 145, 176, 178, 189, 193-208, 246 f., 270
  force, 197
  problems, 264, 285
  unions, 179, 198 ff., 243, 285
Laissez faire, 54, 190, 204, 207
Land, 176, 184, 193 ff., 216
Land values, 79, 151
Language, 28, 45 f., 94 f., 100, 280
Latin America, 26, 74, 95, 202, 234
Law, 8, 55, 93, 102 ff., 106, 115 f., 124 f., 127 f., 134 f., 160, 179, 181, 184, 188, 190 f., 194, 204 ff., 209, 220, 222-237, 238 ff., 242, 250, 285, 314, 336
  enforcement, 105-117, 152, 160
Leadership, 163, 260, 274, 286
  principle, 271
League of Nations, 66
Legislation, 204
Legislators, 232 f.
Legislatures, 110, 233
Legitimacy, 118, 126

Lenin, 275
Liberals, 190, 272, 327
Licenses, 213
Life expectancy, 132-144, 335
Lincoln, Abraham, 247
Liquor traffic, 248
Literature, 48
Little Italy, 149, 152
Living standards. *See* Standard of living.
Loans, 217
Lobbies, 156, 249, 283
Locke, John, 271, 320
Lockout, 200
Logic, 321
London, 53
Low Countries, 89
Luxury tax, 213

Macedonian Empire, 49
Machine politics, 151 f., 244
Maladjustment, 61
  personal, 107 f., 122 f., 142, 153, 162-175, 279, 287
  social, 70, 86, 116, 142, 304, 306
Malinowski, B., 316
Malthus, T. R., 321
Management, 183
Manufacturing, 53, 154, 158, 182, 185, 189
Maori, 90
Marginal groups, 98 f., 102, 116
Marginal productivity, 196 f.
Marginal owners, 196
Market, 132, 155 ff., 182 ff., 194, 196 ff., 203 ff., 216, 300 f.
Marriage, 118-131, 215, 255, 284, 289, 301
Marx, Karl, 269 f., 312
Massachusetts, 75
Mass movements, 267-278
Maternal welfare, 81 f.
Maturation, 165, 168
Maya Indians, 47
Mead, Margaret, 316
Mechanical media, 257, 259, 262
Medical science, 341
Mediterranean Sea, 48, 51, 234
  sub-race, 89
Mental disease. *See* Psychoses.
Merit system, 243, 328
Messianic leadership, 275
Methodology, 297
Mexico, 47, 96, 275, 326
Middle class, 51, 54
Middle West, 246
Migration, 23 f., 45, 97, 145, 158
Migratory workers, 206
Militarism, 227
Minimum wage, 204
Minorities, 76, 99 f., 137, 156, 183, 249
Mobility, 25, 189, 288
Mohammedans, 95
Money, 194, 211, 216 f., 300 f.
Mongolians, 88 ff.
Mongoloid race, 21, 88 ff.
Monogenetic theory, 88
Monopoly, 179, 183 ff., 216
Monroe Doctrine, 234
Montesquieu, 312
Morale, 108, 110, 309, 340
Morality, 34, 69 f., 76, 126 f., 140, 171, 257, 259, 300 f., 342
Mores, 34 f., 38, 40, 42, 69, 91, 99, 108, 119 ff., 126 f., 130, 159 f., 222, 256, 310
Mortality, 128
Moscow, 49
Motion Pictures, 126, 158, 168, 177, 257, 259
Motivation, 6, 126 f., 136
Multiple-party system, 240
Multiple-purpose projects, 185 f.
Mysticism, 126
Myth, 86 ff., 100, 102, 316
Mythology, 46 f., 56

Napoleon, 62
National Association of Manufacturers, 250
National Brewers' Foundation, 250
National honor, 234
Nationalism, 55, 61, 65 ff., 270 f., 326, 330
Nationality, 94, 100
National Recovery Act, 180
Nations, 29, 51, 62 ff., 74 f., 86, 114, 133, 146, 178, 183, 186, 201 ff., 216 f., 219 ff., 224, 228, 267, 288, 309, 335, 338
Natural increase, 149
Naturalization, 98 f.
Natural law, 272
Natural resources. *See* Resources, national.
Nazis, 114, 141, 337 f.
Negro, American, 23, 88, 91-101, 102, 125 f., 137, 152 f., 155, 206, 245 f.
Negroid race, 21, 88 ff.
Neighborhood, 164, 170, 178, 256
Neolithic man, 45, 56
Neuroses, 139 ff., 168 f., 172, 174
New England, 154
New immigration, 98 f.
New Mexico, 154
Newspapers, 189, 257, 287, 315

New World, 98
New York, 75, 147
New York City, 244, 248
New Zealand, 90
Nile Valley, 47
Nomadic peoples, 56, 145
Non-tax revenues, 211, 215 ff.
Nordic sub-race, 89 ff.
North Africa, 49
North America, 26, 54, 74, 96
North Dakota, 154
Nuisance tax, 213 f.

Objectivity, 296, 304, 339
Occupations, 123, 138, 165
Occupational diseases, 138
Odegaard, Peter, 315
Old age, 81, 133, 136 ff., 145, 165, 169
Old immigration, 98 f.
Old Testament, 47
Old World, 98, 123
Oligarchy, 226
Open shop, 199
Ordinances, 230, 232
Orient, 147
Oriental civilizations, 47
Orientals, 99 f.
Out-groups, 69, 71, 86, 92, 100
Overpopulation, 26
Overproduction, 155, 203

Pacific, 147, 157
Pacific islands, 95
Paleolithic man, 45, 56
Palestine, 23
Panaceas, 113 ff., 279, 290 f., 305, 336, 341
Parliament, 229
Parliamentary government, 228 f.
Parole, 111, 301
Particularistic fallacy, 113, 127
Partnerships, 180 ff.
Party platforms, 156
Pastoral economy, 52 f.
Patriotism, 63
Patronage, 151 f., 219, 242, 245
Patronage refund, 187
Peace, 63 ff., 115, 134, 235, 262, 338
Pennsylvania, 24, 75
Penology, 111
Perjury, 213
Personality, 6, 70, 77, 102 ff., 107 f., 116, 118, 139, 141, 153 f., 162-175, 288, 290
Philanthropy, 329
Philosophy, 48, 172, 174, 312 f.
Physical sciences, 3, 337
Physiology, 126, 323
Plato, 49n., 312
Police, 108, 112, 160, 200, 205, 218, 231 f., 244
Police powers, 235
Policy, 181, 183, 186, 190, 197 f., 207, 215 ff., 227, 234, 238, 283
Political activity, 62, 87, 129 f., 145, 156, 177, 198, 219, 241, 309
Political crimes, 114
Political organization, 49, 51, 62 f., 66, 99 f., 119, 146, 151 f., 183, 210
Political party, 164, 239 ff.
Political science, 4 ff., 65, 112, 233, 281, 288, 290, 310 f.
Politics, 39, 64, 66 f., 97, 145, 199 ff., 207, 219, 230, 238-254, 282, 309 ff., 328
Poll tax, 211
Polyandry, 120
Polygamy, 120
Polygenetic theory, 88 f.
"Poor whites," 155, 206
Population, 7, 14, 18 ff., 55, 68, 109, 123, 141 f., 144 ff., 149, 156, 169, 256, 264, 269, 282, 314
  composition, 136
  optimum, 78
Populations, 62, 74, 76, 78 ff., 96 ff., 114, 128, 159, 196, 289, 328
Post Office, 185
Poverty, 55, 61, 73-85, 86, 99 f., 113 ff., 127 f., 132, 145, 150 ff., 157, 244, 308, 316
Precincts, 241
Prediction, scientific, 10 f., 17, 24, 36 f., 77, 301
Prehistory, 5, 44, 46, 51, 321, 323
Prejudice, 97, 108, 157, 316
Preliterate peoples, 5, 46, 311, 322
President, 219, 227, 229, 231, 238, 252, 276
Pre-social man, 36, 103
Press, 258, 262
Pressure groups, 156, 199, 248 ff., 262, 283, 285
Prestige, 39, 177, 235, 249, 318, 332
Prices, 79, 155 f., 178 f., 183, 187, 190, 196, 202, 215, 220, 299, 336
Primary relations, 55, 116, 118-131, 160, 172
Prime minister, 229
Primitive peoples, 5, 48, 53, 89, 119 ff., 222, 311, 322
Principles, 300, 304, 308, 318, 325
Prisons, 109, 112, 114
Private enterprise, 79 ff., 134, 186, 200, 215, 324
Private property, 255

Probation, 111
Problems. *See* Social problems.
Proclamation of Emancipation, 97
Producers, 178
Production, 78 ff., 81, 112, 122 ff., 127, 130, 138, 155, 176, 178, 185, 191, 193 f., 203, 324
Professions, 129
Profit, 176, 181, 195, 197, 209, 216 f., 219 f.
  motive, 176, 219
Progress, 40 ff., 46, 136, 176, 281, 344 ff.
Progressives, 41
Progressive taxes, 211 ff., 220
Prohibition, 228
  party, 248
Propaganda, 249, 255-266
Property, 118, 125, 127 f., 135, 190, 202, 205 ff., 211 f.
Proprietor, 180
Prosecutor, 252
Prosperity, 79 f., 214, 220
Prostitution, 115, 126, 138
"Protection," 242
Pseudo-science, 87, 92, 114, 124, 141, 163, 268
Psychiatry, 129, 135, 143, 162, 171
Psychology, 3 ff., 129, 162, 171, 287, 330
Psychoneuroses, 70, 139 f., 143, 169, 174
Psychoses, 61, 133, 139 f., 168 f., 172, 174
Public enterprises, 184 ff., 190 f., 211, 216 f.
Public finance, 68, 151, 209-221, 310, 325, 329
Public health, 253
Public interest, 202 ff.
Public opinion, 200 f., 205, 255-266
Public relations, 264
Publics, 177, 202 ff., 256 ff., 260, 265
Public safety, 218
Public utilities, 179, 184 ff., 191
Pueblo Indians, 268
Purchasing power, 197
Pygmies, 90

QUACKERY, 135
Quarantine, 134
Quasi-individuals, 232
Quasi-judicial, 252
Questionnaires, 315
Quota laws, 98
Quo warranto writ, 233

RACE PSYCHOLOGY, 92
Races, 5, 10, 21, 23, 76, 86-101, 102, 107, 116, 137, 141, 157, 269, 285, 322, 335
Racial myths, 92, 99
Racial policies, 93
Racism, 93 ff., 273
Radicals, 41, 206, 281
Radio, 159, 189, 257 ff., 262, 265
Railways, 146, 148, 158, 179, 201, 203 f.
Rationalism, 281
Rationalization, 219, 286, 290
Real estate, 151, 212
Recession, 79
Reciprocity, 121, 159 f.
Reconstruction, 64, 245 f.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 185
Recovery, economic, 79, 180
Recreation, 77, 116, 129 f., 132, 143, 145, 150, 159 f., 309, 316
Reform, social, 10, 39, 136, 144, 199 ff., 206 f., 219, 273, 297, 330, 336, 342
Reformation, 56, 114
Regimentation, 115, 337 f.
Regressive taxes, 211, 220
Rehabilitation, 111, 114
Relief, 75, 128, 133, 145
Religion, 45, 47, 73, 94 f., 119 ff., 123, 129 f., 145, 225, 273 f., 280, 282, 310, 327
Renaissance, 49, 51
Rent, 193
Representatives, 227
Republicans, 240
Research, 188, 316, 339
Resistance to change, 38 ff., 54, 56, 63 f., 70, 72, 80, 86, 118, 130, 133, 148 ff., 162, 228, 295, 342
Resources, natural, 24 ff., 62, 74, 78, 193
Responsibility, 118, 125, 142, 334
Restraint of trade, 180
Revenue, 186, 210 ff.
Revolution, 61, 97, 201 ff., 275
Rights, 39, 66, 86, 114, 181, 205, 226 f., 230, 232, 235
Rio Grande, 154
Risk bearer, 194, 196
Ritual, 47
Rochdale principles, 187n.
Role, social, 39, 42, 163, 165 ff., 170, 260 f., 329
Roman Empire, 48 f.
Romanticism, 96, 124, 126 f., 140
Rome, 49, 145
Rousseau, J. J., 271, 320 f.
Routine, 64, 69 f., 73, 124, 168, 223, 308
Rule of reason, 180
Rural, 97, 106, 123 f., 149 ff., 154 ff., 241, 244, 287, 290
Russia, 18, 114, 227, 240, 275

SABOTAGE, 202
Sales tax, 213
San Francisco, 159
Sanitation, 133
Scandinavia, 187
Schedules, 315
School, 76, 98, 114, 126, 129, 156 f., 159 f., 164, 178, 209, 268, 279-292
Sciences, 3 ff., 9, 48, 55, 65, 77, 88 ff., 124, 135, 273 f., 281, 296 ff., 301, 308, 330 f., 334, 339
Second generation immigrants, 98 f., 102, 106
Second World War, 28, 63 ff., 75, 96 ff., 142, 153, 234, 304, 337
Security, individual, 80 ff., 118 ff., 127 ff., 132, 150 f., 159, 170, 173, 279
Security Council. *See* United Nations.
Segregation, 97, 148, 153, 290
Self government, 156
Senility. *See* Old age.
Semitic people, 95
Sex, 106, 115, 118 ff., 126 ff., 163 f.
  ratios, 21 ff., 137
Sickness. *See* Illness.
Slavery, 55, 96 ff., 125
Slums, 148 ff.
Smith, Adam, 190, 269, 320
Social change, 37 ff., 54, 56, 62, 118 ff., 170, 224, 229, 335 f.
Social classes, 39 f., 47, 51, 54, 86, 106, 157, 159, 164, 206, 290, 312
Social control, 55, 119 ff., 153 f., 160, 222 ff., 235, 256, 286 ff.
Social disorganization, 169
Socialism, 134, 186, 191, 201, 247, 270, 336
Socialization, 168, 174
Socialized medicine, 133 ff., 143 f.
Social mobility, 170
Social order, 37 ff., 43, 61 ff.
Social organization, 29, 35, 47, 51, 62 f., 69 ff., 86, 100, 104, 118 ff., 149, 157, 233
Social philosophy, 312 f
Social planning, 338 ff.
Social policy, 334-343
Social problems, 11 ff., 45, 51, 56, 100, 108 ff., 113, 118, 130, 132-144, 152, 160, 162, 209, 277, 279, 290, 298, 301, 304, 308, 335
  formula for, 13 f., 16, 30, 72, 73, 295, 307
Social processes, 62, 70 f., 104
Social psychology, 4 ff., 64, 70 ff., 107, 112, 163, 288, 316, 330 ff.
Social sciences, 3 ff., 9, 41, 64, 72, 75, 86 112, 118, 129, 136, 162 f., 169, 171 174, 255, 261, 291, 295-307, 308-319 320-333, 334-343
Social Security, 73, 81 f., 128, 173, 185 218, 253, 310
Social service, 73, 273, 289, 297, 309, 32
Social structure. *See* Social organization
Society, 8, 33, 36, 40, 64, 74, 81, 100, 102 107 ff., 112, 119, 132, 142, 159, 162 164, 170, 173, 178, 223, 253, 273, 279 281, 288, 291, 311, 321
Socio-economic classes, 106, 123 f.
Sociology, 4 ff., 69 ff., 107, 112, 165 285 ff., 300, 308, 320-333
  of knowledge, 4n.
Socrates, 312
Solid South, 245 ff.
South, 24, 75, 93, 97 ff., 273
South Africa, 44
South America, 47, 93, 146
South Carolina, 154
Southern California, 154
Sovereignty, 63, 66, 71, 134, 234
Soviet Union, 55, 106, 114, 186, 235, 240 258, 270, 337 f.
Spain, 49, 65, 95
Spanish people, 91, 95
Sparta, 48
Special districts, 212
Specialization, 129, 321 ff.
Speculation, 151
Spencer, Herbert, 272, 313
Stability, 240, 255, 265, 342
Stalin, 275, 304
Standardization, 159
Standard of living, 26 f., 54, 68, 78 ff 123 f., 128, 133, 138 f., 142, 150 f 155 f., 196, 290
State (See also Nation), 125, 135, 15 156, 183, 201 ff., 209, 213, 216, 230 f 236, 247, 252 ff., 282
State capitalism, 191
Statistics, 5, 22, 79, 102 ff., 118, 146, 313 314, 318
Status quo, 40, 54, 170, 269, 270
Status, social, 39 f., 43, 95, 99 f., 120, 12 157, 164, 167, 170, 173, 176, 20 289, 320, 340
Statutes, 230, 232
Stereotype, 163, 261
Sterilization, 140 f.
Stigma, 73, 108, 111, 128, 138 ff., 150, 1
Stockholders, 183, 186, 213
Stratification, social, 39 f., 43, 76, 159 f.
Strikes, 200 ff.
Strike breakers, 200

Sub-races, 89 ff.
Subsistence, 196, 206 f.
Subsidy, 156
Suburban, 147 ff.
Suicide, 162, 168 ff.
Supreme Court, 180, 228 f.
Super-corporations, 182, 201
Surtax, 213
Surveys, 315
Switzerland, 94
Sympathy strikes, 200
Syndicalism, 202

TABOOS, 122, 317
Tammany Hall, 244
Tariff, 214
Tax exemption, 214
Taxes, 61, 66, 68, 79 ff., 133 ff., 185, 187, 190 f., 195, 209-221, 282
Taxpayers, 211
Technology, 27 ff., 55, 65, 74 ff., 170, 273, 297, 335, 339
Teleological theory, 41, 272
Tenancy, 155 f.
Tennessee Valley Authority, 185
Tenure, 206, 285
Theocracy, 225
Theory, 297, 305, 320
Third parties, 247 f.
Tigris-Euphrates Valley, 47
Tolerance, 95 ff., 100, 104, 124
Totalitarian governments, 65, 226, 239 f., 253, 263
Towns, 145-161
Townsend organization, 248, 275
Toynbee, Arnold J., 312
Trade. *See* Commerce.
Tradition, 29, 43, 99, 119 ff., 150 ff., 155, 197, 206, 222 ff., 235, 247, 288, 296 f., 333
Traffic, 148
Transportation, 54, 138, 145 ff., 151 f., 158 ff., 182, 184 f., 204, 228
Tribunals, 233
Trotski, 275
Truancy, 287
Trusts, 182
Two-party system, 248

UNDERPRODUCTION, 203
Underworld, 152 f.
Unemployment, 64, 68, 79, 168
  insurance, 81 f.
Union label, 200
United Nations, 66, 235
United States, 21 ff., 52 f., 55 f., 61, 68, 78, 81, 89 ff., 98 ff., 106, 125 ff., 137 ff., 145 ff., 180, 187, 190, 201 f., 207, 210, 214, 216 ff., 238, 258, 327, 338
United States Steel Corporation, 182
Universities, 143, 282 ff., 290, 311, 337
Urban, 97, 137 f., 145-161, 173, 245 f., 290
Urbanization, 54 ff., 123 ff., 137 f., 144, 145-161, 162, 189, 287
Uruguay, 146
U.S.S.R. *See* Soviet Union
Utopia, 312, 342

VALUES, 8, 24, 29, 41, 63, 69, 72, 86, 108, 134 ff., 140, 144, 224, 256, 261, 279, 296, 301, 310, 317, 324
Veblen, Thorstein, 317
Venereal diseases, 138 f.
Vested interests, 38 ff., 63 f., 73
Veterans, 215
Vico, 312
Villages, 125, 245 f., 154 ff.
Violence, 100, 108, 150, 152 f., 168, 198, 200 f., 205, 274, 341
Visiting teachers, 289
Voters, 152, 156, 204

WAGE EARNERS. *See* Workers
Wages, 79, 190, 193-208, 217 f., 220, 285, 324
War, 47 ff., 61-72, 142, 168 f., 185, 215 ff., 235, 256, 262, 264, 296, 310, 328, 337
Ward, Lester F., 272
Wards, 241
Washington, D. C., 147
Wealth, 53, 68, 150, 157, 170, 210 f., 324
Welfare agencies, 128
Wellbeing, 176
West, 97
Western Civilization, 40, 44-57, 269, 280, 334 ff.
White collar workers, 197, 206
White race, 86 ff., 102, 106, 125 f., 273, 276
Women, status of, 55
Workers, 81 ff., 127 f., 130, 132 f., 177, 181 f., 189, 194-208, 209, 218
World court. *See* International court
World trade, 67
Writ of mandamus, 233
Wyoming, 159

ZONING LAWS, 135
Zone in transition, 147 ff.