PAGES MISSING WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

TEXT CUT WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_148601
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No 302 Acc. No. 13731
B26T

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

BY

WALTER GREENWOOD BEACH

Professor of Social Science, Stanford University

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

WILLIAM F. OGBURN, PH.D.

Professor of Sociology, Columbia University



HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

The Riverside Press Cambridge

LONDON

ISAAC PITMAN & SONS LTD.

KINGSWAY, W.C.2

COPYRIGHT, 1925
BY WALTER GREENWOOD BEACH
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

THERE are many excellent reasons why this book by Professor Beach will be welcomed. The scope of the subject-matter is rather more comprehensive than usual, including essential contributions to the study of society and its problems of economics, political science, psychology, education, and ethics. Such a treatment is needed, for it is becoming quite apparent that lines of demarcation between the special social sciences are unrealistic. There are few social problems to-day which can be understood without drawing upon contributions from various branches of the social sciences.

Such a treatment is needed also by the student who is getting his first introduction to sociology. He wants a broad picture of the whole before becoming immersed in the details. Witness, for instance, the growing popularity in our colleges and high schools of a single introductory course to all the social sciences.

The author's success in preparing a comprehensive introduction to sociology is due in part to his wide orientation and to his many years of experience as a teacher. His skill is shown by a rare simplicity and perspective that could only come from a broad and full understanding. The excellence of the organization of the materials is due not only to a wide familiarity with concrete, illustrative facts, but to a happy mingling of these facts with analysis and theory. By thus removing the arid stretches from his text, the author holds the interest of the non-specialist. Pervading the whole is a fine spirit, singularly free from prejudice, that must certainly lead the reader to a strong constructive interest in human betterment.

WILLIAM FIELDING OGBURN

PREFACE

THE increasing importance of social studies is strongly felt by all who have to do with education. The idea is more or less accepted that growing minds are bound to be interested in the relations of men with each other, and may be guided toward a more definite consciousness of these relations and of the mutual obligations involved in them. But it is still a problem to know how best to take advantage of this interest and how to guide it most effectively. The methods now used are of many kinds, showing little or no agreement as to what material should be presented to the beginning student.

The present book is, in part, an effort to meet this problem. The writer, after many years of teaching, believes that Sociology is perhaps the best approach to all the social sciences. Sociology has also a strong appeal to all types of mind through its direct bearing upon many of the critical problems of the present world.

The plan of the book is to present as simply and as concretely as possible the elements of sociological theory illustrated by social problems. Many theoretical questions have, therefore, been touched upon but briefly. Concrete social problems, however, are not developed independently, but in close relation to theoretical discussion.

The text has been designed throughout to meet the needs of introductory college classes. It has been used in outline form with successive classes in three institutions for a number of years. Much of its value has been due to the suggestions and stimulating questions and criticisms of my students. The "Questions" which follow each chapter are intended only as a few examples to be supplemented by the teacher.

The writer finds it difficult to make suitable acknowledgment for the help derived from sociological thinkers. My interest was first aroused by reading Giddings's *Principles*, and ever since I have con-

tinued to find great stimulus in his writings. Cooley and Ross, each in his own way, have been sources of constant and valued suggestion. Many others have been drawn upon, but it becomes impossible to remember the sources of very many of the opinions presented. In particular, I owe great thanks to Professor W. F. Ogburn, who has kindly read the entire manuscript and has given me the benefit of his wide knowledge and stimulating criticism.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Human association — Social inheritance — The fundamental facts of evolution — Community — The meaning of history in society.

PART I. ELEMENTS: NATURE AND MAN

CHAPTER I

PHYSICAL NATURE AND ITS MODIFICATION 11

The influence of physical nature on society — Technique, or the modification of nature by man — Interrelation of economic activity and social organization.

CHAPTER II

HUMAN NATURE: POPULATION DIFFERENCES 18

Distribution of the sexes — Varying age distribution — Differences in the marriage age — Difference in vitality — The size of populations — Social capillarity.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF MAN: CHARACTERISTICS 25

Human nature both inborn and acquired — Inborn beginnings — Instincts and their limitations — Function of inborn nature — Certain important instincts. Food and sex — Associative tendencies — Sympathy — Fear and flight — Anger and pugnacity — Curiosity and acquisition.

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN NATURE: HEREDITY AND INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES 39

Variation in capacity and type of mind — Eugenics — Feeble-mindedness — Relation of feeble-mindedness to social problems — Measures of elimination — Insanity — Philanthropy and selection — Education and eugenic marriages.

CHAPTER V

MARKS OF RACE 47

Intermingling of inborn and acquired traits — Physical marks of race — European sub-races — Slight difference between races in inborn capacity — The blood of the American people — The negro element — White race varieties — Problems of racial purity and inequality.

CHAPTER VI

ACQUIRED HUMAN NATURE 56

Habit as socially developed human nature. Interstimulation — Habit and growth — Relation of habit to inborn nature — Typical habits as illustrations — Summary.

CHAPTER VII

CERTAIN DEGENERATIVE HABITS 62

Liquor habit and social welfare — Alcohol and degeneracy — The saloon problem — Methods of social control — The drug habit — The gambling habit.

CHAPTER VIII

HABIT AS CULTURE 70

The organized associative life or culture — The biological life-cycle.

PART II. THE BUILDING OF SOCIAL LIFE

CHAPTER IX

COMMUNICATION 77

Communication the basis of society — Forms of communication — Isolation and diffusion.

CHAPTER X

MENTAL PROCESSES AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE 83

Suggestion, imitation and sympathy — Influence as a social fact.

CHAPTER XI

GROUP LIFE: VARIETIES AND TRAITS 88

Groups vary in stability — Crowd characteristics — Primary and secondary groups.

CHAPTER XII

HOW GROUPS ARE HELD TOGETHER 94

"Force" or physical compulsion through punishment — Custom as the basis of social unity — The power of the social heritage — Contact of cultures lessens social differences — Origin of likeness and difference in social heritages — Social menace of the power of custom — Mores or standards — Historical values of great peoples.

CHAPTER XIII

CHANGE AND WHY IT COMES 106

Changes are both planned and unplanned. Why they occur — Migration and war — Invention — Fields of invention — Summary of causes of social change — Eras of change.

CHAPTER XIV

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES SUGGESTED BY THE FACTS OF CUSTOM AND CHANGE 114

Change is necessary for social welfare — Resistance to change — Social direction of change. Principles to be observed — Other possible factors in social unity.

CHAPTER XV

CONFLICT 120

Social values of conflict — Social evils of conflict — Domination and exploitation — Methods used in acquisitive conflict.

CHAPTER XVI

THREE IMPORTANT VARIETIES OR FIELDS OF CONFLICT 127

I. RACE CONFLICT OR THE CONFLICT OF COLOR. Why race differences lead to conflict — The negro problem — The negro in the United States — Possibilities of adjustment between white and black — Social aspects of the negro problem — Chinese and Japanese — The Chinese in the United States — The Japanese in the United States — Summary.

II. CONFLICT BETWEEN NATIONS. Evolution of conflict group units — Why conflict between nations is harmful.

III. CONFLICT BETWEEN CLASSES. The basis of class division — The assumed social function of private property — The effort to acquire property is not necessarily productive — Present criticism of existing ownership of wealth — Labor and capital as classes — The wage question — The question of the control of the processes of production — Struggle of labor to improve its position — Relation of class conflict to government and public opinion — Summary.

CHAPTER XVII

METHODS OF CONFLICT 159

I. WAR. Early war — Why modern war does not lead to progress — Illustrations from the Great War — Summary.

II. ECONOMIC COMPETITION. Monopoly and competition — Possible modification of evils of competition.

III. DISCUSSION. The organized use of discussion.

CHAPTER XVIII

COÖPERATION 170

Why cooperation takes place — Types and aims of coöperation — Methods and units of cooperation — Cooperation a continuous process — Summary of Part II.

PART III. SOCIAL ORDER, SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS, AND SOCIAL CONTROL

CHAPTER XIX

THE CHARACTER OF INSTITUTIONS 179

Institutions form the basis of the social order — Institutional relationships found in social evolution — Function of institutions.

CHAPTER XX

POPULATION AND THE FAMILY 183

Family function and historical backgrounds — The modern family and its problems — Social values of normal family life — Modern conditions which react upon family values. Industry — Labor mobility a factor — Bad housing — The employment of women and children — New social contacts — The strength of the people — Problems of population quality — Education and income in relation to health — War and births — The declining birth rate in the Western World — Divorce and desertion — Change in the position of women — Moral aspects of divorce — Desertion — Changing economic and moral influences more fundamental than law — Freedom of woman — Women in industry — Relation to family welfare.

CHAPTER XXI

THE FAMILY AND CHILD WELFARE 203

Dependence of family welfare upon community life — Facts which illustrate the problems of child welfare — Child health — Dependent children — Delinquent children — Social factors in delinquency — Community and family responsibility for prevention of delinquency — The juvenile court — Child labor — Modern industry creates a demand for child workers — Legal protection for children — Two causes of child labor — Child labor not of educational value — Harmful conditions of work — Standards suggested — Summary in regard to the family.

CHAPTER XXII

THE ECONOMIC ORDER 223

Production of wealth always a social fact — Function and problems of the economic order.

I. EVOLUTION IN ECONOMIC LIFE. Technique and social organization — Steps in development — Domestication of animals — Domestication of plants.

II. THE MODERN INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION. The mechanical phase of the Industrial Revolution — Changes in the organization of business — Social consequences — The redistribution of population.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE ECONOMIC ORDER (*continued*): MOVEMENTS OF POPULATION IN AMERICA — IMMIGRATION 236

Characteristics of American immigration — Causes of immigration — Race or blood mixture through immigration — Economic aspects of immigration — Social aspects of immigration — Immigration policy — The assimilation question. Relation to industry — Immigrant colonies — Agencies of assimilation — Levels of assimilation.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ECONOMIC ORDER (*continued*): REDISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION — COUNTRY AND CITY 252

The growth of cities — Causes of city growth.

I. RURAL LIFE AND ITS PROBLEMS. Modern science and increased capital used in agriculture — Agricultural economic problems — Social aspects of rural life — Possibilities of social betterment — Summary.

II. THE CITY AND ITS LIFE. City characteristics — Neglect of city-planning — Special city problems and community responsibility — City housing — City health and the social cost of sickness — Money cost of sickness — Relation of sickness to poverty — Sickness and human suffering — Remedies — City recreation — Recreation is social — Commercialized recreation — Relation of the level of recreation to industrial conditions — Social provision for city recreation — Concluding summary.

CHAPTER XXV

THE FUNCTION OF THE ECONOMIC ORDER 283

I. MACHINERY AND LABOR. Work and the mind of the worker.

II. CONCENTRATION OF OWNERSHIP.

III. CONFLICT BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR. Effect of the industrial revolution upon the position of labor.

IV. POVERTY OF THE MASSES. The nature of poverty — Extent of poverty — Causes of poverty — Remedies suggested. Charity inadequate — Social minimum standards — Other proposals — Consequences of poverty.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE POLITICAL ORDER AND SOCIAL CONTROL 300

Social authority and social control — Origin of government — Relation of governmental development to changing economic life — Government and the making of public opinion — The problem of the control of the press — Law and freedom — Government and the lawless use of force — Law and individual obligation — Need of easy methods of changing law — Rights essential to democratic government — Government and industry — From regulation to administration — Lessening of governmental control in certain fields of life — The trend toward democracy — Limitations upon governmental control under autocratic rule may work badly in a democracy — Is democracy a failure? — The problem of equality — National and world political order — Crime and social control — Theories of punishment and prevention — Social conditions as a cause of crime — Heredity and crime — Degenerative habits as causes of crime — Punishment may increase crime — Improvement of education and social conditions essential.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE MORAL ORDER AND SOCIAL CONTROL 324

Social control through standards of conduct — Social standards and values shape individual character — Traditional standards versus reflection — Variation in standards — What moral standards do — Building standards — Inner and outer control — Loyalty — Religion and morals. Stages of religious evolution — Religion becomes identified with social standards of morality — Moral idealism enforced by religion — Summary.

CHAPTER XXVIII

EDUCATION: SOCIAL CONTROL AND PROGRESS 335

Educability of man. Society an educational environment — Special educational institutions are necessary — The school and the development of knowledge — Transmitting the social heritage — The growth of knowledge — The school and its growth — What shall be taught — Vocational aims and difficulties — Education and social relations — Control of the school — Is educational opportunity really universal and adequate — Special schools and educational movements — The press and other educational means — Education and progress — Community surveys — Research bureaus — Coöperation and education.

CHAPTER XXIX

PROGRESS AND THE ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL EVILS 355

INDEX . . . . . .

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

INTRODUCTION

PERHAPS never before in the history of the world has there been so great a need to understand the nature of human society. The growth of scientific knowledge has given to man an increasing control over nature, and the methods of scientific research now in use insure that knowledge will continue to advance, giving promise of limitless succession of discovery and invention. But in spite of the progress of scientific knowledge with its transformation of nature, the human world is a world of disorder, of strife and of great suffering. The life of men together, their relations one to another, the grouping of men in social units, and the relations of these units to each other, are by no means satisfactory, nor do these relations seem permanent and fixed. Men live in societies, and the character of these societies is itself a product of their life together, a human organization. At the same time the character of the social unit or group itself becomes a power in the formation of the life and nature of the men who are bound together in it. It is both natural and very wise, therefore, that so much of the best thought of our time is being directed to the study of society, in the hope and belief that only through an understanding of our social life can the advance in scientific knowledge really be made to serve the life of mankind. "We must let our minds play freely over all the conditions of life till we can either justify our civilization or change it." [1] The most difficult of all arts is the art of living together. The merest glance at the turmoil of the world to-day must suggest to any observer that this art is far from perfect, yet no one can doubt its vast importance. To understand how to build better relations among men, how to

[1] Wallas: *The Great Society*. p. 15.

enable human beings to live together in better and finer ways, is without question the greatest need of the present age.

Human association. To the student this art of living together presents two problems: first that of its ultimate purpose which concerns itself with the building of the best sort of society and secondly, that of its present status which concerns itself with the forms it takes, the forces that are at work in it, the changes which are taking place and the ways in which they arise. Sociology is thus a study of human relations, both of the forms they now take and of the processes by which they may be reconstructed. The kinds of social units which exist or have existed are very many and varied. But they are all alike in that they are types of association. Society is association, and it is only in association that human life is found.

Association is a mental fact; it refers to contact of minds. In every association or society or social group there is something in common between the individuals making the group, and it is because of this fact that they are able to make a society. List a number of kinds of societies and ask what it is which makes each a society. For example, to begin with a very inclusive society: 'Christendom' suggests a social unity, and the basis of this unity is a system of ideas, sentiments, beliefs, knowledge, which is shared to some extent by the various members of this widespread human society. So, to instance a very different social unit, an 'Employers' Association' suggests certain economic interests which are common to the various members; while a 'Trade Union' suggests a counter economic interest shared by laborers. An artist colony is made up of men whose similar intellectual interests and appreciation of the beautiful make them understand each other and enjoy each other's company. So families, friendship groups, churches, nations, corporations, historic eras constitute societies or social units, and each suggests that those who make it up have common interests, do things together, or are like each other in mind — factors which lead to mutual understanding.

Each social unit to which one belongs suggests some type of relationship between its members, and these relationships modify the lives of the individual members. In the family the relationship is that of affection, authority, and obedience, suggesting discipline

and self-sacrifice; in an athletic team the relationship is that of mutual support and recognition of leadership; on a cotton plantation in the South before the Civil War the community or social life was based on subordination and forced service — master and servant. Some relationships are made by government and are compulsory; others are ethical, expressing ideas of right and a consciousness of obligation; some suggest pleasure, while others involve suffering. It is these varied relationships which constitute the social atmosphere which influences and moulds the minds and characters of individuals. For while it is true that individuals make their societies, and so the quality of each society depends upon the type and character of individual life; equally is it true that the body of relationships which make up a society moulds the life of its members. Every society is an educating environment which determines the life of the individuals composing it.

Social inheritance. It is well to recognize, therefore, at the beginning of the study of the nature of society, the profound truth that "no man liveth unto himself." In every group of people, whether it be savage or civilized, there grow up customs and fixed ways of acting and thinking. These have to do with the great and fundamental interests of mankind — work, play, knowledge, obligations, and worship — and they make up what we call the 'civilization' or 'culture' of the group. A child born in such a society or community not only inherits from his parents certain instincts and impulses to action, which are rooted in his physical organism; he becomes also a part of a social system or way of living, which is made up of a great variety of customs, usages, and laws. And these ways or customs of his society also become embedded in his nature until he thinks and acts as those about him. In this way he acquires new inheritance from his community, and while the instincts with which he is born determine his disposition and temperament, this *social* inheritance largely determines the kinds of acts and ideals he will approve and admire, and the ideas and beliefs he will hold to and act upon.

If one were to enumerate or describe the great discoveries of science, the great inventions in industry and the arts, the new ideas in politics, in religion, and in morals, he would be reciting the funda-

mental stages in the *social evolution* or evolution of community life, and he would be emphasizing the great law of group development. *For it is fundamentally true that the individual members of the community have not developed and do not develop except with and through the changes or evolution in the organized activities of the group.*

The fundamental facts of evolution. It is necessary in studying our social life to recognize that modern science has made us realize the great law of evolution which shows how life from its simplest to its highest forms is constantly undergoing modification. Three facts are fundamental to an understanding of this law. One is the fact of variation, which means that as species of life appear in the world they are found to vary somewhat, one from another, not being identical with each other. The second fact is that of selection. In a given environment or place of living one species is selected rather than another, because of the special qualities which give it an advantage as compared with others, and so enable it to survive. This is called the survival of the fittest or best adapted. The third fact is that of heredity or inheritance. Qualities found in the organism tend to be transmitted or handed on to its offspring, thus continuing the adaptation and permitting the species to survive in the given environment.

These facts explain the gradual development of special varieties of plant and animal life in different regions and places. It is the work of the biologist to study and explain these facts and to show their bearing upon all phases of life. In doing this he has made clear the idea of development, and we are more and more realizing how completely all phases of life are dominated by this idea. If, therefore, one wants to understand the life of the community, he must constantly bear in mind that change in it is inevitable and certain. If he were studying the inborn qualities which have developed in individuals and species, he would be studying the facts and conditions of biological evolution; but if he is studying the changing system of community life — its laws, customs, language, knowledge, and the like — he is studying the facts and conditions of social evolution. And just as in biological evolution there are the facts or laws of variation, heredity, and selection, so in social evolution there is variation, heredity, and selection. Social groups differ

from each other in customs, language, laws, and morals; between these varied customs and morals, selection is taking place, some of them being better adapted to existing group or community life than others; and those customs, morals, inventions, and laws, which are selected become a social inheritance, handed on in the group from age to age. Not that they are inherited at birth as the color of the hair or skin, but they become fixed in the minds of the members of the community as they advance from childhood to adult life, and one may truly be said to inherit them from the community life. And so communities survive, just as plant and animal species, because or in so far as their social life and activities — laws, knowledge, customs, arts, industries — are superior, in the sense of being better adapted for survival than those of other competing groups. Evidently the permanent welfare of every individual is closely dependent upon this social life, and it is vitally important for him to know and understand what are its characteristics, its points of strength and weakness, and the possibility of its improvement.

Community. It is apparent that each person belongs not only to one social group, but to many. And it is worth noting, also, that the more varied his interests are, the larger the number and kinds of groups to which he belongs. His relation to such groups should not be thought of as something formal, though at times this may be so, as when an alien becomes a naturalized citizen through a legal process, or a student is admitted to college upon examination or the presentation of proper credits. More often, however, the process is unperceived, and the individual may not realize this group relationship. An interest in the drama may make one a member of Shakespeare's company of players, as an interest in music may lead one into fellowship with a circle of composers or singers of to-day or of an earlier time. The vital point to observe is simply that men do not live in isolation, but always in contact with others; the unit of society is what may be called a companionship, a group whose contacts are mental. It is not primarily important that men occupy the same space, but it is important that they live and think and act in mental relationships, being conscious of each other, and so under the influence of their mutual life.

Because of the fact that group life is universal, every individual

is surrounded not only by a number of others, but also by a mass of relationships between them and by an intermingled mass of ideas about them. These other people, and especially their varied relations and ideas, form (using a figure of speech) a sort of human soil in which each individual lives. His life receives its impetus and growth through being rooted in this soil, and is shaped and limited by its quality and character.

More appropriately, the ideas and relationships of group life form the social environment of the individual; and the social environment envelops him as does the atmosphere. At times a few groups only may exist together as a unit, or it may be that a great and complex diversity of groups may be so united. In either case the unit group life constitutes what is vaguely called the 'community' or 'society.'

Such a community may, for some purposes, be the nation. In the opening weeks of the Great War the United States may be said to have constituted a single community. On the contrary, the municipality is a community in so far as its varied individuals and groups share a common life, and though its many political, economic, religious, or social groups may often be in conflict with each other, yet overshadowing and influencing them and their relations is the fact of the common municipal life. For a great part of mankind even to-day the village is the most real community, and during earlier epochs of history, as the Middle Ages, the usual and indeed almost universal community life was found in the isolated rural village.

But whatever its size or form, whether it be the simple and isolated village, the small town, the city, the nation, or at times the world, the universal fact is that human life is lived in the midst of other life more or less related to it. The individual may be in conflict with the surrounding community life at times, but never is he entirely aloof from it. Like the air he breathes, it touches him, it supports him, it nourishes him, it controls him. His thoughts and feelings are more or less subject to its influence; his acts are born through contact with its will. It is as though a mass of colored threads are woven into many figures and all together formed into a colored tapestry. The colors blend, each affecting the other; the figures run together in a common pattern and these into an arrange-

ment or system of many patterns making a single unit. One thread by itself has no independent meaning; its character and significance are the consequence of its relation to the woven whole. Likewise the individual and his many groups are bound together in the community or social life. The community is the web of life within which each plays a part, and the part receives its tinge and form by its relation to the whole, depending upon the kind and character of the community.

The meaning of history in society. Moreover, the community is always historical in character. By this is meant that the character of group life is what it is, in part, because of the ideas, struggles, and arrangements of the past. No generation begins a new world, but always it enters a human life already organized, whose knowledge, laws, and purposes arose in earlier times. Every incident of the past of a society becomes a factor in bringing that society to its present form and position. The difference between the historical incidents and conditions of one society as compared with another started each of them upon divergent roads, so that after the passage of ages these societies, perhaps quite similar in their remote pasts, have often become very different as a consequence of these differences of knowledge or action in their history. It is impossible, therefore, to understand the life of any society without a knowledge of its history. Without question a sympathetic understanding of one's society rests upon a knowledge of its historical aspirations, beliefs, and actions.

READING REFERENCES[1]

Lindeman, E. C.: *The Community*, chs. I–IV inclusive.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, part I.

[1] Students will find that a constant reference to the events of everyday social life will greatly increase the interest and value of the text. For this purpose, in addition to the usual daily and weekly press, *The Survey* will be found especially helpful, through its social news and its extremely well-selected and timely articles upon questions of importance in varied fields of social life. Many Government publications will be found of use, also, such as the publications of the United States Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The most important source of information in regard to child welfare is a series of publications of the Children's Bureau. The annual reports of the National Conference of Social Work contain many valuable papers in the various fields of applied sociology. Critical discussions and the results of social research appearing in the *American Journal of Sociology*, the *Journal*

QUESTIONS

1. Draw up a list of the important groups to which you belong. What has led to the existence of each of them? What has led to your being a part of each? Assume that, one by one, they cease to exist: what is left of yourself?
2. Does an immigrant to the United States drop out of the groups to which he has previously belonged? Why or why not?

of Applied Sociology, the *Journal of Social Forces*, and other journals specializing in fields of thought nearly related to sociology, will be found stimulating and helpful by those who are willing to explore beyond the covers of a textbook.

PART I
ELEMENTS: NATURE AND MAN

CHAPTER I

PHYSICAL NATURE AND ITS MODIFICATION

The influence of physical nature on society. Society is a complex product into which enter many elements as factors. At any given time it is evident that the character of a society is limited and conditioned at least to some extent by physical nature. The geographic basis of human life, the relation which physical nature holds to associated human life, is a field of study of great interest. Recent students of geography have insisted that their subject is definitely a social study, since the importance of physical nature is its relation to the aggregations of men which are called societies. Surrounding man is a natural physical environment upon which he must rely as the basis of life. Its character and quality must evidently be a vital factor in determining the character and quality of the life which is developed. Some students go so far as to hold that practically all the important developments in civilization are the result of variations in the natural environment. Though this is probably an exaggeration, it is still necessary to recognize the part which physical nature plays in the affairs of men.

The effect of climate upon man is not difficult to observe. The size of societies and the type of activities engaged in evidently vary with conditions of cold and heat and degrees of moisture or dryness. The effect may be direct upon man himself — that is, it may directly affect his body or mind; or it may be indirect, influencing his occupations and methods of work. Extreme heat and extreme cold set limits and give direction to man's activities, just as do also excessive or deficient rainfall.

Of much greater significance in determining the organization of societies are the character of the soil and its resources, and the contour or outline appearance of the earth. The significance of these aspects of nature is found in the fact of their influence upon the size of human aggregation and the nature and ease of social contacts. Most fundamental to man are the resources of nature which supply

his material wants, and the way in which regions are made easy or difficult of access through natural highways or other means of travel.

As we advance farther in discussing the problems of society, it will become clear how fundamental is the fact of social contact. The size of societies depends upon it; the character of the civilization of a people or an age is greatly affected by it. But social contact rests in part upon the resources which nature supplies, and upon the natural lines of travel, such as valleys or plains, which make possible the meeting of societies and their products.

Illustrations of this fact may be found in noticing the natural habitats or homes of peoples who have developed important civilizations at different ages in the history of man. Early civilizations were usually found in fertile river valleys, such as the Nile, the Tigris-Euphrates, the Po, and the Yellow River. In these regions were combined natural fertility and accessibility. The Nile, with its annual overflow leaving a deposit of silt which continually enriched the soil, made possible large crops which furnished food for a relatively large population. The valley itself was also a natural highway connecting the interior country with the Mediterranean Sea and thus making possible the exchange of products and a more varied supply of the means of living.

Civilizations of importance have not developed except where it has been possible for fairly large aggregations of men to be gathered together. Small numbers do not have the possibility of sufficient specialization of activities to go far toward the building of those forms of associated living which are essential to vigorous social life and growth. But large aggregations of people depend for their existence either upon good natural resources which furnish a sufficient supply of food and clothing as well as other materials essential to physical life, or upon easy accessibility to their home region so that the means of living may be brought from other places. Regions which combine these two qualities — fertility and accessibility — have become the natural homes of the large aggregations of men. "Only bountiful and easily traversable areas permit aggregations which can develop into large societies," says Giddings.[1]

It is apparent, likewise, that natural resources and accessibility

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 82–85.

are complementary advantages as a basis of social life; each is strengthened by the other. For ages in the history of mankind, immediate and direct dependence upon nature for a food supply drove the race to constant migration. Instead of each people having a fixed abode, it is probable that men were constantly on the move. And the more traversable the occupied areas, the greater could be the range of migration in search of those food supplies which nature provided. Trails, roads, waterways, therefore, enlarged the area and so the quantity of the food resources of a people. At the same time they made possible new social contacts and the building of new social relations as a consequence. In this way men were able to possess both a wider range of natural resources and also of human experience, and so it became possible for some groups to pass from dependence upon supplies discovered from day to day, to the storing of food and other necessities.

Where the contour of the earth is favorable to the movements of population and so makes migration easy, there has naturally resulted a growth of population due to the coming together of many separate groups or peoples. This mingling of peoples is one of the most striking phenomena of historic ages and indeed of long prehistoric periods in the life of man. Diverse human characteristics were blended, varied customs and traditions clashed and strove for survival, and new ideas were brought to light through the contrast of conflicting folkways and beliefs.

Technique, or the modification of nature by man. The importance to man of natural resources is easy to see, but it is not so commonly observed that the value of particular resources varies greatly with the development of technical knowledge on the part of the occupying population. Food resources and soil fertility probably come first in importance, considering the average development of man's use of resources, and the insistence of his want for food. Mineral and timber resources become of increasingly larger value, however, as scientific knowledge grows; and from time to time hitherto unused resources become of importance because of new scientific knowledge or invention. The conflicts of mankind have often and for ages been directed toward the areas of natural rich food supply — the Mohawk and the Ohio valleys, for example, or

the famous Egyptian Nile. But only at advanced stages of human development have men fought for hidden deposits of gold or coal or oil or copper.

It is evident therefore that a discussion of the function of physical nature in the making of society must recognize that nature is a vague term, and that to what extent it really is a part of the environment of men, is dependent upon man himself. Man is constantly using and modifying his geographic background in new and varied ways as he learns more about nature. Through this progress in utilizing nature he develops what has been called a technical environment. That is to say, at any time we are not surrounded simply by nature, but rather, and of most importance, by a modified nature which is more directly influential upon man's life than physical nature as such.

As a consequence at one stage of human knowledge a given region may be uninhabited, while at another it may be the center of a population or the basis of conflict between many peoples. An illustration of this shift in the importance of regions and their resources may be found in the present dependence of the world upon energy supplied by fuel. Ours is a mechanical age, using mechanical power. Coal and oil have become the energy-supply fuels, and as they are found only in limited quantity they are the basis of much of the present conflicts of the world. Mr. E. E. Slosson, in writing upon the "Fall of Energy and the Rise of Man,"[1] says:

> We have built up our splendid civilization on fossil fuel, the accumulations of the Carboniferous Era. What will happen when it runs short as sometime it must? . . . This is not a remote and speculative question, but the most vital question of our day. The two essential sources of our energy are:
>
> 1. Food, which provides the internal energy of the human body and is irreplaceable.
>
> 2. Fuel, which provides the external energy of engine power and for which no adequate substitute is in sight.
>
> Man's life depends on food. Man's civilization depends on fuel. . . . In primitive times men fought for food. The bones of contention now are the coal fields of the Saar and Ruhr, the oil fields of Mesopotamia and the Caucasus.

[1] *The Independent*, February 12, 1921.

Evidently coal and oil are humanly important only because there is a new environment for man, a body of ideas and their expression in material form, and this environment rests in part upon the use of these means of energy.

A great part of the history of man is the record of his struggle to compel nature to serve him. Nature has thus been a constant limiting factor in the life of man. Progress in knowledge is largely progressive success in the control and utilization of nature; a process by which the limitation is modified to a greater or less extent. Nature thus does not make society and is not a direct factor in its construction, but it is on the one hand a limitation and on the other a basis of social life.

Of greater importance, therefore, in regard to social life than physical nature is the modified nature which bears testimony to conquest by man. The struggle to live has led to the discovery of natural laws as well as to the utilization of material objects. Such discoveries as the making of fire or the invention of the boat or the wheel as instruments of transportation, suggest the beginnings of the modification of nature. Tools and weapons gave man a new supply of food and materials with which to meet his other pressing wants. The knife, the bow, the hatchet, the wheel, the container made from clay or other material, weaving, and fire are among the more important inventions through which man both controlled and modified nature. To one coming after these inventions, nature was not what she was to his predecessors. A somewhat different order of discovery brought to man a food supply not directly the gift of nature. Such discoveries were the domestication of animals and the cultivation of seeds. These made possible the breeding of flocks and herds and the planting of crops. From them could result a richer society and one of larger numbers.

Interrelation of economic activity and social organization. Most of these discoveries and inventions, it should be noticed, have to do with the problem of making a living. And so man came to be surrounded with what may be called a 'work' environment or social heritage, work standing for those activities of man through which he supplies his daily wants. This environment is not only one of objects but of ideas about nature. Not only have cattle and sheep

become a part of the so-called 'natural' environment of man, but what they may do for him — their social utility — appears to him as their essential quality.

It is necessary to observe also that man does not work alone any more than he lives alone. He lives in groups and he works in groups. The work environment therefore is for each man a group relationship to nature. Group work is natural to man. It also is more efficient. It brings greater product because it permits specialization. Specialization gives skill to the worker; but all special activity makes necessary coöperation or working together. This may be illustrated by the simple division of labor of early life between man and woman, and points to a coöperating group as the basis of work as much as does a factory of one of our large cities with many thousands of workmen.

The point of significance in all this is that the method of attacking or utilizing nature in the making of a living develops a set of group relationships through which man approaches nature. This becomes a part of his technical environment. Not only are there roads and bridges and buildings, but occupations, methods, and relationships which both limit and aid his use of nature. It is not difficult to see, for example, that when animals were domesticated and groups of men came to use the products of such animal life for food and clothing and housing, and the animals themselves for transportation purposes, the life of such a society came to be thoroughly directed and ordered with regard to this central and controlling fact in its common life. Such a change in the method of using nature became not only a set of ideas about nature, but also a set of relations between the various members of the group, based on division of work between and among men and women and children. Thus nature furnished a background of life, but each individual was related to nature primarily through the technical organization of society by which nature was controlled and utilized.

This body of ideas and relationships and actual changes in nature itself has been called the technical environment of man in distinction from the natural environment; or, since the making of a living is so central a part of it, it is also spoken of as the economic environment. It evidently is a vital factor in bringing into existence the

CHAPTER II

HUMAN NATURE: POPULATION DIFFERENCES

THUS far attention has been directed to geography or nature as the background or basis upon which societies grow and by which they are limited as well as aided in development. Yet nature itself is not a direct cause of societies; the causative factors lie in man himself — in human nature rather than in geography. Human nature is, in one aspect, a purely biological fact. Human beings are born, live, and die as do the lower orders of life; and they differ one from another because of characteristics which follow from the laws of the growth of animal organisms. While it is quite impossible in description to keep entirely separate the purely biological aspects of human life from those aspects and characteristics which are the result of association and so of man's changing culture-life, it is of import to hold in mind the fact that the biological phases have a limiting and controlling power over the making of societies in the same way that geography has. These phases may be briefly indicated under the term 'population.'

Population is a phenomenon which has attracted the attention of economists as well as biologists for a long time. There are principles which have to do with its growth and character. It may be observed that populations differ in such regards as number, age, sex, and the rates of birth, marriage, and death. All these differences seem to be unrelated and unimportant to the usual observer; yet from them and the variation in their distribution arise conditions which have to do with some of the most serious of modern social problems. For within populations, the number of the two sexes, for example, is not always alike; the proportion of children to those in middle age or old age also varies; and the percentage of those who marry, or those who die in a given time, is not fixed.

Distribution of the sexes. Populations differ in the distribution of the sexes. On the average it appears to be true that the birth of males slightly exceeds that of females, the rate for European coun-

tries being not far from one hundred and five boys to one hundred girls born alive.[1] To some extent this preponderance of male births is balanced by a greater infant male death rate, so that the sexes tend to grow to adult age more nearly equal in numbers; yet the number of males always tends to maintain a slight excess over females except in the older years and under unusual social conditions.

While the natural difference in the numbers of the two sexes is not very great, social conditions often bring about much greater differences. For example, pioneer populations always show a decidedly large preponderance of males. The same thing is true of countries to which immigrants are flocking, the contrary being true of countries of emigration. Ross calls attention to the fact that the relative proportion of the sexes varies according to the degree of economic and social opportunity for one or the other; that cities which are centers of the clothing or similar industries draw more largely upon women, as compared for instance with cities in which the manufacturing is of a character to employ men, such as steel manufacturing or the shipping industry.[2]

Such unequal sex distribution might seem unimportant in itself as a physical fact, but since the two sexes differ somewhat in mental life and interests, as well as in the social relationships which they tend to develop, this fact becomes of real significance. In communities in which there is a majority of males, male characteristics dominate, as energy and violence, while if the sexes are more evenly divided, law is better observed, or offenses are of a less violent type. These differences may, however, be obscured by other social factors.

Varying age distribution. Populations differ in age. It is usual to divide life into the three ages: childhood, reaching from birth to fourteen years; working or intermediate age, from fifteen years to forty-four; older age, from forty-five years upward.

Where there is a high birth rate and a high percentage of the population in the age of childhood, it is evident that the conditions which make for a high death rate are well controlled. A high proportion of the population in the middle period is usually the result of immigration; a population of this kind shows the characteristics

[1] Morgan, T. H.: *Heredity and Sex*, p. 230.
[2] Ross, E. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, ch. I.

of youth, such as energy, constructiveness, progressive methods, and a tendency to change. The newly settled countries or those parts of a country which show more recent occupation and development are noted for their energy and their departure from old ways. It is thus to be expected that new business methods and new political ideas should at times arise in the western part of the United States, and it is natural that changes for good or ill in social customs and arrangements should also be found in this part of our country. The divorce rate in the United States is greatest in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast States.

Particularly is the difference in the distribution of ages important in regard to immigration. Much the largest proportion of the stream of immigration to our country is in the middle and working age period. This is the age, regardless of nationality, at which most work is done, most discovery is made, most new activities are begun, most experiments are undertaken, most creative effort is launched, most old arrangements and methods are thrown upon the scrap heap, most poetry is written, and most crime committed. In judging the value and danger of immigration to this country this fact should be kept in mind.

Differences in the marriage age. The marriage age varies in different populations. A laboring-class population usually marries earlier than a middle or wealthy class, and the age at which marriage takes place advances as wealth increases and civilization becomes more complex. In rural life marriage takes place earlier than in city life, due to the simpler social life of the country and to the greater economic advantage of marriage for agricultural as compared with manufacturing and commercial occupations and life.

Difference in vitality. Probably even more significant than the varying age distribution of populations is the difference in vitality as shown in varying rates of birth, death, and sickness. Populations grow in two ways: by congregation, or the uniting together of previously separate groups or individuals, as seen in war or colonization or immigration; and by the difference between the birth rate and the death rate. The population of the entire world grows, of course, by the latter method only. The same rate of increase may result when there is a low birth rate offset by a low

death rate as when the birth rate is high and the death rate also high. And it is a fact of great importance that a high birth rate is usually accompanied by a high death rate. Further, it is true that the lower the form of life in general, the greater is both the birth rate and the death rate. Evidently a high birth rate is not necessarily an advantage; but the important aspect of the matter is the relation of the birth rate to the means of living and to the standard of living. A population with a small birth rate, but an adequate food supply, and a standard of living which demands and makes possible reasonable education and other conditions of social value, will probably prove to be a stronger population than one of higher birth rate, but with a less adequate food supply and lower general living standards.

The size of populations. Though a population is not the same thing as a society, it is of course the beginning out of which a society grows. The difference in size between populations is itself of great consequence in determining the kind of society which may result, only large societies having the possibilities of that division of occupation and interests which seem to be essential to discovery and progress. But the size of a population is never a matter of mere chance; its growth is definitely subject to certain fundamental conditions.

The first of these conditions is spoken of as 'natural resources, referring primarily to soil fertility and other natural conditions which support human life. It is a commonly accepted opinion that, taken by itself, there is a tendency for population to grow with greater rapidity than the food supply.[1] A country of rich natural resources will support a larger population, of course, than one of poor resources; but even a rich soil has its limits of productiveness, and this limit inevitably sets the bounds for the size of the population.

But why is it that a given region may produce more of the means of life in one age or under one type of management than in another? The American Indians never attained a large population, yet they

[1] This opinion dates from the statement of it by T. R. Malthus in his *Essay on Population*, first published in 1798. It has been attacked by writers of more recent date, but there is strong ground for its acceptance.

roamed over the same fields and through the same forests which support a far larger population of the white race. This question suggests the second factor determining the size of a population. This is the system by which a people makes its living; and it depends upon its technical knowledge. If the system of life is the care of flocks and herds, a larger population can be maintained than if hunting were the only source of the food supply; but the population will be much smaller than if agriculture were the basis, and still smaller than would be the case if manufacturing and commerce dominated the industrial life. Evidently 'natural resources' vary with the technical knowledge of people to use them; the older economic thinkers called this 'the stage of the arts.'

There is still a third factor which is of great consequence in the control of population growth. This is a psychological and cultural aspect of the problem: what standards govern the actions of men? What interests appeal to them? What wants will they try to satisfy first, and what ones will they sacrifice in order to satisfy other wants? This factor is called the 'standard of living' and this is especially important in determining whether life shall be born into the world. The standard of living varies among peoples and between classes within a single people, the result being that one people, with given resources and with a given technique of production, will have a higher birth rate than another in the same situation. In general it is true that populations of poor education and development have a low standard of living and a high birth rate.

The limitation of size of a population may take two forms; either through the birth rate or through the death rate. Poverty, disease, war, and famine contribute to a high death rate. Where misery and ignorance abound, the birth rate is likely also to be high. The spread of education, the greater freedom of women, and the growth of luxury have brought a lowering of the birth rate, while the increase of knowledge and education has also lowered the death rate.

Population is thus decidedly variable. If the spread of knowledge is applied to industry so as to change the system of production, a larger population may result. This was the case following the great mechanical inventions of the eighteenth century; the populations of different European countries were multiplied by from

two to five times. But as education, travel, and property have come within the range of a larger proportion of populations through the increase of wealth, the birth rate tends to fall, so that at the present time a lowering of the birth rate is characteristic of all the countries of Europe.

Social capillarity. It has been asserted by Dumont as a principle of population that population varies inversely with a tendency to rise in the plane of social life. This he calls the law of 'social capillarity.'[1] It seems to be substantiated by what is known of the birth rates in middle-class families as compared with families of day laborers. A reduction in the number of children is characteristic of the middle class, evidently being the result of the influence of a higher standard of living.

It will be noted that it has been impossible to describe so apparently simple a fact as the growth of population in purely biological terms, and without finding as one of its governing conditions the social-cultural factor called the 'standard of living.' In other words, while the biological basis of human life is evident and significant in the study of society, it is not by itself an explanation of social fact.

READING REFERENCES

Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, chs. XIX and XX.
Ellwood, C. A.: *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, ch. IX.
Giddings, F. H.: *Elements of Sociology*, chs. I to IV.
Fairchild, H. P.: *Applied Sociology*, ch. XI.
Kelsey, C.: *The Physical Basis of Society*, ch. IX.
Newsholme, A.: *The Declining Birth Rate.*
Reuter, E. B.: *Population Problems.*
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. I, II, III.
Taussig, F. W.: *Principles of Economics*, vol. II, chs. 52, 53, 54.
Wolfe, A. B.: *Readings in Social Problems*, chs. I, II, V, VI.
Wright, Harold: *Population.*
Carr-Saunders, A. M.: *The Population Problem.*

QUESTIONS

1. Find the facts about the increase of European populations during the nineteenth century, and suggest the explanation.
2. What has been the trend of birth rates in different parts of the world during the past twenty-five years? — of death rates?

[1] See Dumont: *De population et civilisation.*

3. Why does France fear a low birth rate? What are the possible advantages to her of a low birth rate?
4. Is a stationary population an indication of national decadence?
5. Why did the American Indian population not become as large as the white population of the United States to-day?
6. Do all classes or groups within a population grow at the same rate? Why?
7. How does the standard of living affect the size of a population?
8. What is the possible effect upon size of population, of the development of dry farming methods? — of the introduction of better varieties of wheat?
9. How has immigration affected the age composition of American population? Compare childhood, middle age, and old age.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF MAN: CHARACTERISTICS

Coöperating with physical nature in the making of society is human nature. An understanding of the more important aspects of man's nature throws light, as a consequence, upon the problems of social life.

Human nature both inborn and acquired. Fundamental to an appreciation of human life is the distinction between that which is inborn and unlearned and that which is acquired. There is a tendency in living organism to continuance. From generation to generation men inherit inborn tendencies from their ancestors, receiving from them what the ancestors themselves received from those who preceded them. While it contradicts usual impressions of our own importance, it is generally agreed that there is but little if any difference in inherited nature between man of to-day and his ancestors in the early ages of man's historic life. The tremendous differences which exist between, let us say, the Englishman or the American of 1921, and the Greek of the Homeric age or the Teutonic invaders of the Roman Empire, are due to the accumulation of social usages, organization, and knowledge which constitute distinct civilizations. These differences are not inherited; they are acquired; they come to men in the process of learning and through associations.

Nevertheless, the inherited characteristics are the starting-point in our human nature upon which organized life rests, and there can be no understanding of social life without recognizing what they are and how they act.

The sort of world we live in is limited and conditioned by the sort of people we are; and we as human beings are very complex products, not easily described nor always the same. Human nature is not determined by inheritance, but neither is it wholly an acquisition from the social environment. Its beginnings are inborn, while its particular quality and tone and content are more largely the

result of the social life in which it develops. In other words, the mind of man has a certain degree of stability, of fixity characterizing it from birth; but this fixity is only true in a relative sense. Variability or the possibility of modification or direction is equally characteristic, and the controller or director of modification or growth is the social organization in which it exists. It is this social organization also which gives the mind of man its quality, that is, its culture content.

Inborn beginnings. We may begin the description of human nature, therefore, with its inborn aspect. Aside from physical features, which will be referred to in another connection, the child appears in the world having a variety of ready-made tendencies toward action and feeling. It is this mental mechanism of response to stimuli which is the important aspect of his inborn nature. As experience in the world grows, through contact with other life and with physical nature, these inner tendencies, commonly called 'instincts,' develop into fixed habits or sentiments, or lead to reflection or thinking. Neither habits, sentiments, nor reflection are inborn, though the capacity to acquire habits and to think, of course, are. Each of these three elements — instincts, habits (including sentiments), and reasoning or thinking — should be considered not as something strange to be examined as a curiosity, but as something of value in enabling us to live. Instinctive tendencies, ordered and modified through habit and feeling, and aided and controlled by reflection, are the great instruments by which life is adjusted to the means of life and the struggle to live made possible.[1]

It is necessary, therefore, to observe that at birth there is already within us a variety of impulses toward action. These impulses drive in certain directions, and at the same time are often, though not always, emotions or 'feelings.' The impulse is brought into action through external contacts or stimuli, but the inner impulse tendency is there ready to be set loose. The actions which result from such impulses do not need to be learned. It is as though there were a ready-made mechanism for certain activities of value to life.

[1] In view of the present conflict among psychologists over the problem of instinct, it has seemed best to present the view which appears to the writer to be most probable.

The child cries, reaches, or sucks without needing to be taught. It is true, however, that these inborn 'drives' are not accurate guides to action; instinctive action is constantly in need of being taught when and under what circumstances to express itself. In other words, it must be adjusted through experience after birth by means of gradually acquired habits and sentiments. Because of the fact that they are in general fundamentally alike from individual to individual, there results a common human nature, a nature that enables men to have, at least to some extent, a common life. But equally is it true that the instincts vary from individual to individual in intensity at least, from which it results that men differ one from another, so that the development of individuality also has its beginnings in the variety of instinctive tendencies.

The cry is perhaps the inborn beginning from which language develops, but language itself is an acquisition, and the possibilities of fine expression in one or another of the different known languages is dependent upon association.

How many instincts or 'unlearned tendencies to action' there are is a matter of dispute. They are springs of action and so have to do with the nature of character itself.

Instincts and their limitations. Comparison is often made between the instincts in animal and in man. Probably human instincts differ from animal instincts principally in the fact that they are more subject to modification. Animal instincts operate in a limited field of action, and in animals, far more nearly than in man, instincts are an adequate equipment for action. Certain of the lower animals seem to act at birth almost as definitely and successfully as those of greater age. In other words, there is no need of a period of childhood in which the learning processes may gradually be built up and thus the individual become adjusted to the kind of world in which he is to live. The mind should be thought of as an instrument of adjustment by means of which the individual is able to act in his world. In the simple world of animal life, this process of adjustment is simple and therefore the instincts, driving to set and definite action, are adequate to bring about the necessary adjustments. But the world of man is complex. For ages the effort of man to control his world has led to new knowledge and ever-

increasingly complex relations among men. For adjustment of the human being to his world in any age, therefore, instincts are quite inadequate, and the need for a period of time during which the mind may acquire through learning the necessary habits which modify instincts is imperative. This is the explanation of what was called by John Fiske, the "meaning of infancy," and it differentiates man from the animal world.

Nevertheless the instincts remain the great initiators of action and they are insistent in their demand upon our lives. They are both helpful and harmful; they drive us with tremendous power, but since there is no certainty that their demands should be followed, the control and regulation of them is vital. For it is not to be expected that tendencies to action which were formed in primitive human or pre-human ages are or can be safe guides to the complex life of to-day. Moreover, instincts run counter to each other and if one dominates, the others remain unsatisfied. Some order among them, some relationship between them, some regulation with reference to their relative importance and their relations one with another, are essential to an ordered life.

Thus it is that there is felt a need for control and education of the instincts, and as the development of men is in groups — in association with each other — the associated group life or society undertakes and feels the need of the control of these 'unlearned instinctive tendencies to act,' so that society's members may be brought to useful rather than harmful action and life.

What may perhaps be called the first order of instincts is made up of those tendencies to action which have to do either directly or indirectly with the sheer struggle to live. The second order may be said to be composed of those tendencies which are a part of the need to 'live well.' In the first order may be grouped such tendencies as are suggested by the need for food and shelter, which are essential to the preservation of the individual, the sex impulse through which the preservation of the life of the species is made possible, the herd or gregarious instincts and sympathy, leading to group life without which neither the individual nor the race could survive. Fear, anger, pugnacity, acquisitiveness — all, either directly or indirectly, are impulses the function of which is to maintain and preserve life

through directing its activities. Of the second order of impulses are such as the sheer tendency to be active and so to play; the constructive or making instinct, and curiosity.

Function of inborn nature. It is evident that certain of these tendencies are vague and general; so much is this so that psychologists differ greatly in their effort to classify and describe instincts. It is probably fair to say that many instinctive and emotional activities are grouped together to make up, for example, such a so-called tendency as that of fear and flight. But for the purpose of the student of social life, the real importance is to realize that the individual is endowed at birth with an impulsive mechanism of adaptation to his environment on the basis of which and through the use of which his life is directed and driven. And the great function of his experience, that is, his life as an individual in relation to other human life — his acquired life in distinction from his inborn tendencies — is, through habit and reflection, to improve this impulsive mechanism, modifying, directing, and controlling it in the face of more complex social arrangements and toward richer and finer possibilities. Evidently the problem of 'living well' rests more and more upon reflection and the development of better life-habits in control of instincts. Yet it must always be remembered that the inborn impulses are powerful forces which may be directed and regulated to social values, and which in the main give the key to human nature and must not be entirely thwarted and denied. Social problems, taking the form of irritation, discontent, lawlessness, and even revolution, are sometimes the result, at least indirectly, of the failure of society to recognize and reckon with the power and reality as well as value of inborn instincts and their accompanying emotions. Society's failure to recognize the natural tendency to play results in forms of juvenile crime; the evils of the saloon or of the dance hall have to do with social instincts which find no other opportunities of expression; and violence in isolated labor camps may perhaps in part be accounted for as the result of thwarted or unsatisfied instincts of sex, of acquisition, and of curiosity. It is extremely important that society should find safe and yet satisfactory outlet wherever possible for normal instincts, and should not thwart their expression needlessly. Encouragement of

the full, the abundant life, is socially desirable, rather than the limited and over-repressed life. It is unfortunate that social usage so often is quite disregardful of human instincts, custom demanding their repression. Too often the result is some extravagant outburst of savagery and evil. The inborn nature inevitably will be educated and directed, but it cannot be violently or unduly repressed and thwarted without taking its revenge. It is wise, as Thorndike [1] expresses it, to "so arrange life's work as to have natural tendencies assist rather than oppose it."

Finally it is to be observed that each inborn tendency to action is accompanied by an 'awareness' of the tendency and of the satisfactoriness of its results. This awareness which gives a sort of tone to the instinctive process so that we like or dislike it, is what is called emotion. It often becomes either a support or a weakener of the instinct, and is itself subject to change or modification, just as is the instinct itself. The modifications of the individual nature which occur after birth and through experience, are modifications both in the unlearned or original tendencies and in their emotional accompaniments. How we 'feel' about experiences and so about the manifold phases of life itself, has thus both its inborn and its acquired aspects.

Certain important instincts. Food and sex. Inborn tendencies which are most immediately necessary to the physical life of man are the instinct to seek and take food and the sex instinct. Upon the first rests the possibility of the physical existence of the individual, and upon the second, depends the continuance of the race. The economic life of man depends to a great degree upon the first, at least in its simpler expression and stages, so that any account of the economic ways and institutions of an age or people, becomes an examination of the methods by which men have so arranged themselves toward physical nature and toward each other that they might supply their need for bodily sustenance. What these methods are at any time and how they are or may be modified, is a considerable and vital part of the effort to understand the problems of human society. Whether the tendency to acquire and own is an instinct or rather a naturally resulting expansion of the food and

[1] Thorndike, Edward L : *Elements of Psychology*, p. 196.

shelter tendencies is a matter of uncertainty. In any case the acquisitive tendencies, whether instinct or habit, become a dominating factor in the economic life and are of even greater importance in giving to the economic arrangements of society their distinctive character.

The sex instinct (and the parental instinct which is undoubtedly closely related to it) finds importance primarily in relation to the race rather than the individual. Yet the emotions associated with the instinct powerfully affect the individual life. Probably no other instinct is so greatly in need of control and direction in order to insure the welfare of society. In its insistence upon the continuance of life nature has developed in man an instinct which if uncontrolled would destroy the possibility of social life. Yet it is important to observe that some of the finest emotions have, through the gradual development of the life of man, become associated with this instinct and have thus shown how great is the possible modification, through training, of the entire instinctive equipment of man. Every society has found necessary and has developed some system of usages which are methods of control of the sex instinct. The family, which is one of the most vital of social institutions, is organized about it, together with the parental instinct; and customs and laws which regulate marriage are the outgrowth of the consciousness, among even the earliest peoples, that this instinct must be ordered and directed by considerations of social welfare if it is not to become destructive.

Associative tendencies. It is a matter of common observation that people tend to associate with each other. This tendency in man to find his fellows has been noted and commented on from early times and by all sorts of thinkers; and the effort to account for it has taken many forms. To-day the tendency is usually regarded as inborn. No understanding of the advantages of association is necessary to bring about the fact of society; an appreciation of these advantages arises later and becomes a factor in directing the training of the instinct itself. All through the animal world, including man, is found the gregarious or herd or social instinct. The impulse to associate with one's kind has probably been embedded in animal and human nature through selec-

tion in the process of ages of struggling to survive. The need of the association with our fellows in order to live is the basis for the existence of this instinct, though this advantage must not be understood to be the reason why the individual seeks his kind. Instincts are inborn tendencies through which man is adjusted to the world he lives in; they are 'drives' which remain embedded in the inherited nature because of their value for survival. But for each individual they are springs of action the value of which is not at all necessarily perceived or observed. He acts instinctively in this regard, not reflectively and through conscious reasoning about the value of such action.

It is easy to see, however, that society depends for its life upon the social instinct. Flocks and herds are characteristic words in regard to animal life; this fact of group living is basal to the existence and characteristics of the animal world. In the same way men seek each other and instinctively form themselves into groups. It is interesting and of value to make a list of 'group' words, which suggest the social tendency in man; such words are, for example, *tribe, gang, club, circle, clan, order, people, brotherhood, union.* Of course, each has its special meaning, but these and a great many others contain primarily the idea of association.

It is evident, therefore, that while it is 'natural' for the individual to struggle to preserve his own life, it is equally natural for him to obey impulses which lead to the preservation of the life of society. The struggle to live is not only an individual struggle for one's self, it is equally a "struggle for the life of others." [1] A large part of the history of mankind is a record of the gradual growth and enlargement of the knowledge and consciousness of who the 'others' are and how, through coöperating with them, all life may grow richer.

Sympathy. Closely related to the general tendency of association with one's kind — the herd instinct — is the tendency toward sympathy. This term is used with varying meanings,[2] but the tendency to transfer the life of others into ourselves, and so to experience their life directly, is in its basis instinctive and inborn.

[1] Drummond: *The Ascent of Man*, ch. VII.
[2] See McDougall: *Social Psychology*, p. 90.

The herd instinct would have relatively little significance were it not for the fact that there is the inborn possibility and tendency for those who associate together to share in a common life and so to understand and appreciate that life. The emphasis in sympathy is usually upon the emotional side of life; we cry or laugh when others cry or laugh; we admire or detest what or whom we find others admiring or detesting. Suffering binds us in common undertakings, and on the basis of sharing in the suffering of others we come not only to feel with them, but to understand both their lives and our own.

In a larger way we may recognize that not only do we feel with and for our fellows, but their ideas and actions become ours also. If ideas and actions pass from person to person without the intervention of reflection, that is if one adopts the idea or the action of another 'without thinking about it' or choosing to do so, this process is called suggestion — if it is an idea that is uppermost — and imitation, if it is an action that is passed from one to the other. Some students have assumed that suggestion and imitation are direct and separate instincts, and much importance is placed upon them in relation to social life. Others are inclined to believe that they are better thought of as aspects of sympathy rather than independent instincts or tendencies. Though the latter seems to the writer to be more nearly the truth, for the purpose of this brief sketch the question is not vital. The really important thing is to recognize that there are born in us certain social tendencies through which we may experience the feelings, the ideas, the actions of our fellow-men. Whether these are thought of as separate, or as a suggestion-imitation-sympathy complex, the fact that life in its three sides of idea, feeling, and action is common to the members of groups or societies is of fundamental importance. Because of it we have contagion in society; ideas are 'catching' like measles; so are hatreds and prejudices and good cheer; and equally so are bodily motions, dialects, and gestures. Fashion travels from Paris or London or New York to every village, and one village looks like another, builds like another, talks like another. A superstition starts in China and may be accepted and practiced in Chicago. An outburst of 'color' hatred sweeps a crowd and a lynching follows or

anti-racial legislation in a dozen States. Children starve in Central Europe and men and women in Georgia, Idaho, New York, or anywhere send millions to their relief. For good and for ill, ideas, emotions, and actions sweep from man to man, and often without reflection or thinking. Life influences life, and because of this contagious influence leadership becomes possible and what men think and do becomes a social fact and is embodied in customs which continue to spread as the enlarging circles in a pool when a stone has been dropped into the water.

Closely related to the sympathetic predisposition is the tendency to respond to praise or blame from our fellow-men. The delight simply in being with others — due to the herd instinct — is directed and guided through our susceptibility to praise and blame. This tendency is quickly developed into habits which are the outgrowth of social custom. In this way society unconsciously controls individuals. It is not easy to stand against the sneers or criticism of society. The hooting of the crowd tends to 'rattle' the pitcher on the baseball field; the fear of the scorn of others leads to our wearing the clothes of the prevailing fashion; the cheering of the multitude encourages the runner to do his best. Because of the power of this instinctive regard for the opinion of others, the group (society) has worked out systems of expressing its approval or disapproval. Rewards and punishments are society's organized way of giving praise or blame; thus the criminal receives the blame of society in the form of systematized punishment, precisely as the man who 'eats with his knife' is made conscious of the disapproval of his neighbors by their elevated eyebrows and scornful looks. It is evident that the customs of society and the degree of intelligence which governs social life are of vital importance to the individual, because they determine the praise and blame which he encounters. It is possible for men to resist social approval, sometimes through lack of understanding, often through insensibility to social influence, due to a lack in the instinct itself or to a development of habits of indifference to social opinion; or at times such insensibility may result from the recognition that society's opinion is wrong and from the determination to resist it in spite of suffering. But in any case the instinctive reaction to social opinion is

powerful and has much to do with the life and character of society.

Evidently there are a number of instincts which lead men to live and work in groups. These may be thought of as the social instincts and suggest the need of understanding group organization and life — the way societies or communities act as units; for the individual is not the real unit in social life, but the group, the community, is itself the unit.

Fear and flight. The emotion of fear and the instinct of flight or of hiding, together constitute an inborn condition of mind of far-reaching importance. Undoubtedly, like other inborn tendencies, this has become a part of the inborn nature because of its value toward the preservation of life. What one shall fear, when one shall flee from danger and when face it, however, depends upon experience and the situations in which one may be placed. Early life feared many things which modern knowledge tells us are imaginary and harmless, as goblins, ogres, witches, spirits; but it was quite unafraid in the presence of agencies of nature from which we flee — disease germs or defective heredity. It feared starvation and, in part because of this fear, it learned how to raise and store food against the time of need; but the modern laborer's fear of losing his job would have been meaningless to the savage. The impulse is inborn, but it requires direction, training, and restraint according to the social age and development of life.

Fear has had a great influence upon human life. Far too much probably have men been dominated in their action by it. How far it is at all useful is impossible to say, though evidently it is the basis of caution, of foresight and provision for the future. The latter is of peculiar value in that it has led to the accumulation of wealth and the conquest of nature. But the spread of education and the resulting growth of intelligence should remove the ground of fear of supernatural agencies and of disease, while the increase of wealth, reasonably distributed among men, should go far to abolish the basis of those fears which grow out of the lack of the material means of life. Organization among nations should end the vast and haunting fear of war, while better community coöperation and arrangements in regard to conditions of work and recreation, together with more efficient police administration might greatly

lessen man's fear of his fellow-man. These are the lines of social action along which the world's life may wisely be directed and through which fear may at least to some degree be displaced by hope and the forward-looking, constructive life. The effect of fear is suggested by the following statement quoted from Bagley:[1]

> That a maximal degree of efficiency in any line of work is inconsistent with gloom and depression is not only a common verdict of general experience, but a logical inference from scientific principles. . . . Hope and buoyancy simply mean, other things equal, a favorable condition for good work of any sort, while gloom and depression must, by the same token, form a heavy handicap in any line of endeavor.

"In the lives of most men and women," says Bertrand Russell, "fear plays a greater part than hope. It is not so that life should be lived."[2]

Anger and pugnacity. Anger and pugnacity are the emotional and instinctive aspects of another important inborn predisposition. In its less admirable aspect it is seen in a tendency to strike, to fight, and to assert one's self inordinately. Fortunately it has also its better expression, as in the desire to overcome obstacles, to struggle, to be vigorous, and to live upon a high level of effort and accomplishment.

It is thought by many that war is an inevitable expression of this instinct, and that efforts to prevent war must end in failure. This opinion results from a lack of understanding of the nature of instincts. All inborn tendencies are subject to direction and become modified by habit. The customs and ways of society determine the opportunity for growth of habits which express and order instincts. Society's organization of courts is a method of regulating the expression of the fighting instinct, and equally is it possible so to organize the political relations between nations that customs may grow which will further guide and regulate this instinct. Remembering that the instinct is very strong, society is wise if it tries to organize valuable outlets for it. The strenuous activity of sport gives it excellent exercise, rivalry and the desire to excel taking the place of the destructive expression of the instinct. William James[3]

[1] Bagley, W. C.: *The Educative Process*, p. 344. Copyright by the Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

[2] Compare the view of Patten, "the passage from a pain economy to a pleasure economy," in his *Theory of Social Forces*.

[3] *Memories and Studies; A Moral Equivalent of War.*

has called attention to the possible redirection of the instinct toward fine social construction, an organized warfare against poverty and other social ills. He suggests that every one should be expected to give at least a period of his life to the dangerous and often disagreeable tasks which guard society, but which it is so easy for many to avoid. To find tasks which are worth while and which at the same time call forth the strongest effort within us, particularly if they can be associated with real needs of society, is both for the individual and for society the wisest method of conserving the great values and yet avoiding the extreme dangers of the fighting instinct. The problem is really one of finding those forms of habitual social activity which are most useful and, through social emphasis and organization, giving them a standing or prestige which shall make them permanent.

Curiosity and acquisition. Curiosity seems to be an inborn tendency of human nature of the greatest importance. The growth of intelligence separates man from the lower animals; it is curiosity which underlies the desire to know. Through it has come man's control of physical nature and his advance in the modification of the material world. It is important to have in mind, therefore, the fact that it is *natural* to man to investigate and discover, and that ultimately his progress in the world in the changing of the conditions and the organization of life is the result of an inborn tendency.

The acquisitive tendency is considered by many psychologists to be inborn. It is evidently closely associated with the 'struggle to live.' Whether it is simple or complex, acquisitive impulses seem to be common to man, directing his efforts and guiding his purposes. The institution of property expresses this impulse; economic life as a whole is conditioned by it.

It is not necessary for our purpose to go farther in description of man's inborn mental nature. Impulses toward action have their beginnings in this nature; sometimes they are somewhat definite and are described as instincts; often they are more vague, being rather capacities and tendencies. These tendencies to action are very many; they do not agree with each other, and without other direction they would sweep the individual into ruin. The balance among them is not an inborn mechanism, but is the product of

experience in living in society; it is a part of the acquired life, though the capacity to think or reflect is indeed inborn. Nor do the separately described instinctive tendencies actually act separately and alone. Human action is always a complex result of many impelling factors, and human nature is far more complex than so simple a statement seems to imply. The mental structure, even in its inborn beginnings, is a system rather than a number of unrelated factors each operating singly; and the content of every impulse is a complex or network of elements, the outgrowth of instinct and of associations rooted in memory. The effort to describe the inborn equipment of the mind is likely to leave an erroneous impression due to its artificiality; it oversimplifies the nature of mental processes and seems to suggest that definite instincts act each in precise ways leading to precise and certain actions and consequences in social life — a suggestion both artificial and without foundation.

READING REFERENCES

Edie, L. D.: *Principles of the New Economics*, chs. II and III.
Edman, I.: *Human Traits*, chs. IV, V, VI.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, ch. XIII.
McDougall, W.: *Introduction to Social Psychology*, chs. II, III.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. IV and V.
Thorndike, E. L.: *The Original Nature of Man*, pp. 1–7.
Woodworth, R. S.: *Dynamic Sociology*.

QUESTIONS

1. What is meant by inborn human nature? By acquired human nature? Compare and describe 'instincts' and 'habits.' Where do the latter come from?
2. What prevents the unlimited activity of instinctive tendencies?
3. Are instincts adequate guides to human behavior?
4. Does the failure of solitary confinement as a method of prison discipline for the reformation of prisoners suggest the need of recognizing the existence and strength of inborn instincts? Explain.

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN NATURE: HEREDITY AND INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

THE inborn nature of man reveals certain impulses and tendencies as common to the human species. The resemblance or likeness of one person to another is based upon this common inborn nature. Nevertheless the differences between men are striking and these also have their beginnings in inborn human nature. Individuality based on mental difference, both inborn and acquired, furnishes the key to the understanding of the relations of men to each other. Variation and difference underlie the possibility of progress in the animal world and are equally essential to an explanation of the problems of human life.

Two kinds of inborn variations may be described: variation between individuals, and variation between large groups. The first gives us the problem of interrelation of individuals, their measurement of one against the other, their sorting and assignment to work and position. The second is the basis of the problem of distinct races and their intermingling.

Variation in capacity and type of mind. Not only do minds vary in special qualities, but also in general intelligence, and just in so far as intelligence is important in determining behavior and conduct, the degree of intelligence which characterizes an individual becomes the determining factor in his relations with his fellow-men. Minds vary, of course, not only in the degree of their general intelligence, but in their type. But little progress has been made toward a classification of mental types. Professor Thorndike has suggested that three varieties or types may be discriminated. These are the mechanical mind, which is interested in handling objects; the social mind, which enjoys working with people; and the abstract or philosophic mind, which is contemplative and interested in observing the relationship between ideas. Not only intelligence is involved in these type differences, but also emotional factors,

such, for example, as sympathy or interest in the beautiful. It is to be hoped that psychologists will carry farther the effort to analyze and describe mental types. Much progress, however, is being made in the description and measurement of the extent or degree of general intelligence.

Experimental investigation points to a graded difference in mental capacity, ranging from idiocy to genius, the largest group being normal or average, the size of the group diminishing with further deviation from the average in either direction.[1]

The variations for the ordinary, common, or typical man range continuously to such extreme conditions as appear in the idiot and the genius, or Nero and Lincoln. But the great majority cluster somewhat closely around the 'average man.' [2]

To measure mental capacity is the first step toward an intelligent arrangement of people in the allotment to them of their tasks and the determination of their several activities. It also throws light upon the possibility that society may improve its inborn nature, increasing the group of average or higher intelligence and lessening that of low capacity.

Biologists accept the theory that only those qualities are handed on in inheritance which the individual brings with him into the world. What he has acquired in his own lifetime through association with others dies with him. Inborn nature is not modified from generation to generation except through the mingling of diverse strains by intermarriage. To carry on through inheritance only superior ability would be a natural social aim. It is, however, only recently that the knowledge of heredity has developed sufficiently for this to be anything more than a speculation, and even now it is right to say that society is just beginning to understand this possible method of progress. To improve the inborn human nature through social control of individual heredity is the aim of Eugenics.

Eugenics. Two directions may be taken in this effort; one looks toward the direct improvement of inborn nature, the other aims to eliminate the weaker or poorer inheritance. The first is far more difficult and complex than the second; and at the present time

[1] Edman: *Human Traits*, p. 189. [2] Thorndike: *Individuality*, p. 49.

society has made no progress in this direction. The second aim, that is, the elimination of the poorer strains, is more nearly possible, and is particularly important with reference to social problems of serious character. It is known that pauperism, crime, and prostitution have a direct relation to hereditary traits. If society can make progress toward the elimination of such traits, these social evils may be greatly reduced as serious dangers to society.

Feeble-mindedness. Of hereditary weakness the most important varieties are feeble-mindedness, some types of insanity, and epilepsy. Possibly the most serious in its social significance is feeble-mindedness. This term is used to describe all degrees of mental defect including three main groups: the lowest grade, or the idiot, whose intelligence does not exceed that of a two-year-old child; the imbecile, whose intelligence equals that of children from three to seven years of age; the third and highest group known as the 'moron,' whose mind does not exceed the intelligence of children of twelve years.

The two lower grades are of less danger to society than the upper or moron group, because they are easily recognized and are usually kept more or less separate from society. The moron grade is far larger in number and would not be considered defective in mind by the ordinary observer. Yet they are easily influenced and have less than normal control over their actions, together with poorer discrimination as between the qualities and values of different kinds of behavior.

While a proportion of feeble-mindedness is the result of accident or disease in the life of the individual, it is the estimate of students of the problem that at least two thirds of such cases are the direct consequence of heredity; and such hereditary defect will be continued from generation to generation. It is not possible to know with certainty how many there are in the entire population; but the mental examination of particular groups in diverse places makes possible a reasonable estimate of the number. "These estimates vary from two to four per thousand of the population." [1] As a result of the mental examination of the drafted men in the American army during the recent war, "between two and three per cent were

[1] Gillin: *Poverty and Dependency*, p. 319.

rejected for abnormal, nervous and mental conditions, of which conditions feeble-mindedness constituted the largest single group."[1]

Relation of feeble-mindedness to social problems. The fact of feeble-mindedness becomes of special significance with regard to many social problems. It is becoming well known that pauperism, crime, immorality, drunkenness, and similar degenerative conditions are closely associated with inherited feeble-mindedness. The proportion of the feeble-minded in institutions for these classes of society is far higher than in the general population.

Of 600 children appearing before the Chicago Juvenile Court more than 26 per cent were feeble-minded. Of 36,710 prisoners in Scotland, 2500 were weak minded or mentally unstable. Of 800 admitted to Elmira Reformatory, New York, 43 per cent were mentally diseased and 37 per cent mentally deficient.[2]

Professor Gillin says:

We can probably say that 25 per cent of the almshouse paupers are defective.... We shall not be far wrong, therefore, if we estimate that 25 per cent of the cost of supporting the poor in almshouses is due to feeble-mindedness, and that 10 per cent of the cost of public outdoor relief is due to the same factor.[3]

Even higher percentages of feeble-mindedness are found in reformatories for girls, since it is less easy for feeble-minded girls than for boys to protect themselves.

Feeble-mindedness is thus potential crime, pauperism, drunkenness, and prostitution. Not that the feeble-minded are more vicious than the population as a whole, but that they are less able to control their impulses and direct their own lives, thus becoming an easy prey to suggestion of evil from associates. It is necessary to add also that physically they are adults, but have the intelligence to take care of themselves comparable with that of children. In families of feeble-minded parents the birth rate is higher than in those of normal mind.[4] This suggests the need of social control of these lives in order that their inheritance may not be spread.

[1] Gillin: *Poverty and Dependency*, p. 319.
[2] Hayes: *Introduction to Sociology*, p. 250.
[3] Gillin: *Poverty and Dependency*, p. 66.
[4] Bushee: *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 389–91; also cf. Halverson: *American Journal of Sociology* (November, 1920), p. 239.

Measures of elimination. Measures have been suggested to limit the birth of the feeble-minded. Sterilization through surgical operation is urged by many. While it removes the danger of the birth of children, it does not provide needed protection for the feeble-minded, and it is thought that immorality and disease might be increased. However, the results in such States as Indiana and Wisconsin, where it has been tried in special institutions, seem favorable and worthy of further trial.

In the long run the policy which gives greatest promise is that of segregated colonies. The higher grades of the feeble-minded can usually support themselves. In the midst of a rural environment a segregated colony of boys or of girls may easily be self-supporting, and may find much of enjoyment and a useful life. By keeping the sexes segregated in this way, society might greatly reduce its feeble-mindedness in a single generation.

The objection to segregation which is most commonly made is that the cost would be excessive. The fact that in the end society pays the bill in some way should be held in mind in regard to this objection. Many are now kept at public cost in institutions not specially designed for them, such as prisons, almshouses, and the like. The cost to society through crime, prostitution, and destruction of property which can be traced to defective mind is very great. And with all the cost, the present method of neglect permits the problem to grow larger and the social danger to increase. It is unfortunately true that as yet the number of institutions or colonies for the feeble-minded is quite inadequate. In 1920 there were sixty-three institutions in thirty-one States; of these about half are State institutions, the remainder being small private ones. Only fifteen of the total number are found in the Southern and Western States.

Insanity. In regard to insanity, it is only necessary for our purpose to observe that a smaller percentage of the cases is hereditary than is the case with the feeble-minded, though larger provision for their care in the way of hospitals and institutions is made in the United States, and the proportion which recovers is large. The possibility of prevention of the inheritance of insanity is to be found in measures similar to those for the feeble-minded, but the carrying-

out of such measures is far more difficult because of the greater variety of forms which insanity assumes and the extreme difficulty of knowing in each whether it is of hereditary character.

Philanthropy and selection. It is a not uncommon idea that the care of the poor by society through philanthropy is itself a direct means of the spread of feeble-minded hereditary taint, and connected with it is the further idea that those who are poor are so because of their lack of mental capacity; or, in other words, that wealth is itself an indication of, and a reward of, ability in all cases. The first of these suggestions undoubtedly at times has had too much of truth in it. It is only quite recently that the knowledge of heredity has been sufficient to lead to the belief that feeble-mindedness and types of insanity are inherited. Consequently until this knowledge was reached, intermarriage between feeble-minded paupers, criminals, and others who were being cared for in public or private institutions was not looked upon as having serious social consequences in the way of heredity. Institutions tended rather to encourage such marriages. Much remains to be done even now in reorganizing the administration of institutions for the care of the poor, such as county almshouses. But the day is rapidly passing in which such social evils can be charged to charitable or correctional institutions. Enlightened philanthropy more and more is scientific in knowledge and method, and is quite as much alive to the social danger of the propagation of defective mind as are those who consider all charity an evil. The second of the two related ideas referred to is an example of a constantly recurring and dangerous method of thought. It is so easy to assume that those who are unfortunate are also incapable, and that their incapacity is the cause of their misfortune. If the poor and the criminal are so by nature, it seems to remove the pressure of responsibility from the more fortunate, and it seems to furnish a suitable defense for existing arrangements of society. Why make new laws in regard to wealth, if poverty is an evidence of natural inferiority! Against the truth of this method of thought the evidence is overwhelming. Ability is found in every class and among all kinds of people. Far too numerous are the men of distinguished ability whose early life was lived in poverty to make it possible to hold the idea that ability

corresponds to class position. In a democratic society there is a constant movement of individuals from one social plane to another, and the freer the social arrangements the more regular is the movement of natural ability regardless of the possession of wealth. Poverty is itself a serious handicap to the development and exercise of inborn ability in that it limits the opportunities, such as education, which men of all capacities need; but there is little evidence to show that inborn ability itself is not spread over every rank and group in society. In so far as incapacity is a factor in pushing men into poverty, it is to be expected that there will be a higher percentage of incapables in the poorer classes than among the well-to-do. Whether this may not be offset at least in part by the supporting power to incompetency which is afforded by inherited wealth cannot easily be determined. It is to be remembered also that the so-called 'poorer classes' immensely outnumber the more fortunate classes, so that the absolute number of those of poor capacity from the former should greatly exceed the number in the latter groups. At least it is quite safe to say that the few scattered studies based on mental tests are in no way sufficient evidence on which to build the doctrine that social class position corresponds with native capacity.

Society's real problem in regard to weak mind is not a class problem, therefore, but it is to discover the individuals and families which carry hereditary weakness, and prevent their intermarriage and propagation. This in the end will mean new charitable institutions, but preventative in scope and aim and based upon scientific knowledge of the nature of heredity and the social problems which grow out of it.

Education and eugenic marriages. Finally it should be evident that the institution of marriage carries with it certain responsibilities which could not be realized before the growth of our knowledge of heredity in relation to mind. Sound minds are based upon a good inheritance, and every child has a right to ask for such an inheritance. Heredity is not the whole story of the life of each one, but it is the beginning, and it forms the limiting lines of his development. Society may wisely refuse the right to marry to those whose heredity is known to be weak, requiring a physician's certificate

before marriage. More, however, may be expected through education, both in knowledge and in the recognition of responsibility. Young people, before entering upon marriage, should realize that the most important foundation of life for their children is a sound inheritance of body and mind.

READING REFERENCES

Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, chs. XXII, XXIII, and XXIV.
Conklin, E. G.: *Heredity and Environment*, ch. V.
Goddard, H. H.: *Feeble-mindedness*, chs. I, IX, X.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, ch. XIV.
Holmes, S. J.: *The Trend of the Race*, chs. II and IV.
Jordan, D. S.: *The Heredity of Richard Roe.*
Kelsey, C.: *The Physical Basis of Society*, chs. V and VI.
Reuter, E. B.: *Population Problems*, chs. XIII to XXI.
Thompson, W. S.: *Proceedings*, American Sociological Society, 1924, p. 60.
Warner, A. G.: *American Charities*, ch. II.
Wolfe, A. B.: *Readings in Social Problems*, ch. IV.

QUESTIONS

1. What is meant by heredity? Distinguish it from social heritage.
2. Who was Abbé Mendel? Who was Francis Galton?
3. Compare and distinguish the terms 'Eugenics' and 'Euthenics.'
4. In what problems of social degeneration do inborn (hereditary) qualities of mind seem to be important causes?
5. What social problems are suggested by the account of The Jukes by Dugdale, or The Kallikaks by Goddard.
6. Do you know of any families whose history resembles those described in question 5?
7. If drunkenness and feeble-mindedness are found together in many cases, is it clear that drunkenness is the cause of feeble-mindedness?

CHAPTER V

MARKS OF RACE

It has already been said that the problem of the inborn nature in relation to heredity has two aspects. One is the problem of individual difference and the nature of individual quality. The other is the problem of group inheritance of inborn traits, the product of a long-time common ancestry. This is usually spoken of as the problem of race inheritance or the inheritance of race characteristics.

It is commonly accepted that distinct racial groups exist, but the marks that are to be considered the basis upon which they may be distinguished from each other are not well agreed upon. And though physical characteristics such as color or shape of skull may ultimately be accepted as inborn distinguishing traits marking one race as distinct from another, it still remains uncertain whether any inborn mental differences can be found to belong to one race against another, and if so, whether they have any social significance.

Intermingling of inborn and acquired traits. The difficulty in regard to the existence of inborn mental traits is very great. The idea of race is that of a group distinct from other groups by inborn nature. But every group gradually acquires a culture, that is to say, a language, a body of customs, of beliefs, of values, a fund of knowledge, and a more or less complex system of interrelated life, which is the outgrowth of its history.[1] Into this culture men and women are born, and it soon becomes so much a part of their lives that it is impossible to distinguish what is inborn from what is acquired. The consequence is that acquired differences of culture are commonly confused with differences in inborn nature. It is easy to assume that the differences in people who are not like us in their ways are inborn differences. The practical consequence of this confusion of the inborn and the acquired is of importance, espe-

[1] The confusion between the acquired and inborn mental characteristics is strikingly described by Ogburn in Part I of his work on *Social Change*.

cially in regard to the problem of the bringing together of people of different ways and their reaching an ultimate unity. It is frequently assumed, for example, that the varied European groups which have come to America as immigrants are of diverse races and so have inborn mental differences which make them forever separate peoples. Aside from the question of whether really distinct races should or should not intermingle, it is evident that this is not a proper statement in regard to many of the American immigrant groups, since they are not members of separate races, but only of groups whose culture — acquired through separate national history — differs one from another. It is however true that certain of our immigrants belong to what may be called distinct sub-races, and their intermarriage with other stocks in America involves a possible racial modification of the inborn nature of our people.

Physical marks of race. The marks which as inborn traits are considered of most value in separating one racial group from another are primarily physical, particularly shape of the head, color of the skin, and character of hair. "To-day we distinguish a yellow-skinned, straight-haired race, a black-skinned, woolly-haired race, and a fair-skinned curly-haired race." [1]

The usual, non-scientific basis of distinction is skin color, though an association of other traits with the color of the skin is noted and is an essential in separating races. Particularly is this uniform association of physical traits to be observed in the so-called yellow and black races; while the white race shows a greater variety of associated traits.

European sub-races. It is usual to distinguish among European peoples three racial groups — perhaps better named sub-races — these are called the Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean. It is necessary to remember, however, that there are in reality no pure races in Europe. For thousands of years different peoples migrated into and across Europe, conquering and intermarrying with each other. But the differences between them were never anything like so great as that which separates the white, the yellow and the black races; and the resulting mixtures are more nearly correctly described as a mingling of many sub-races. It is well to remember,

[1] Chapin: *Social Evolution*, p. 203.

however, when discussing the question of the danger or value of mixed races, that probably all the stocks of Europe whose descendants are found in America are themselves mixed in origin and their inborn traits are the result of the mingling of many diverse strains of inheritance.

Slight difference between races in inborn capacity. Whatever may be said about the physical differences between races, when we come to try to describe mental inborn racial traits we face, as has already been said, far greater difficulty. Traits which are a matter of common observation, such as Scotch thrift, French versatility, English stubbornness, are quite probably acquired traits, the outgrowth of national experience. Certainly as between the European sub-races, to say nothing of the great true races, it is not at all possible to describe scientifically the inborn mental qualities that distinguish one from another. Evidently we are not at all justified in considering one of these races as 'superior' and another as 'inferior.' This is not to say that real, inherent differences do not exist, nor that on the whole one may not have a higher percentage of the most important inborn mental qualities. It is simply that we have no adequate scientific knowledge upon which to base a conclusion. In spite of this fact, however, the belief of each group is that it is superior to others; this we call race-prejudice, and it, together with the hatreds which accompany the judgment, is the occasion of much suffering and many struggles and conflicts.

The probability seems to be that the difference in inborn intelligence between races is not very great;[1] at least the difference between individuals within a race is far greater than the average difference between any two races. The relative percentage, however, of the amount or degree of high intelligence within a race may vary considerably. Consequently it becomes a very important matter to know what are the varying racial stocks which are united in a single nation. Particularly is this true of a country like our own to which is coming so great a variety of immigrant peoples. Far too slight has been our interest in this problem. A brief statement should therefore be made in regard to the stocks which make up the American people.

[1] See Boas: *The Mind of Primitive Man*, ch. 1.

The blood of the American people. The blood of the American people is drawn from many sources. America has been called 'the melting-pot' because of the great variety of the races which are united here in the making of her people. The principal source of these varied contributory groups is the continent of Europe. To this must be added the negro population of the South, numbering more than ten million, whose original home was Africa, and the comparatively small number of Orientals found principally upon the Pacific Coast and who have migrated from Asia. The American Indian, of probable early Asiatic origin, is also to be remembered as part of the total American people.

The negro element. Evidently the blood problem of America has primarily to do with the many peoples of European origin and with the African negro. The latter constitutes the most difficult blood problem America has to deal with. If the negro blood should be kept separate from the white blood, the problem would be that of the possibility of two separate peoples living side by side with peace and justice. This is a social question of grave difficulty, and is briefly discussed in Chapter XVI. It is to be noticed, however, that, in spite of adverse public opinion backed by State laws forbidding intermarriage, the mingling of the white and black blood goes on and tends to increase. The mulatto stock — part white and part black — is increasing in proportion to the total negro population. If this continues — and the more widely the negro is scattered among the whites the more it is likely to do so — the inborn qualities of the American people are bound to be affected thereby. Whether one race is superior to another, and in particular, whether the white race is superior to the negro, is a matter of assertion and opinion rather than of scientific knowledge. A number of investigations, however, have been made to test the mental ability of the negro in comparison with the white race, much the most important being the so-called 'army tests.' None of these investigations are more than approaches to the problem, and their findings are in no sense complete nor sufficiently adequate to serve as a basis for definite judgment. The tests used probably do not measure inborn capacity in isolation from the acquired aspects of human nature, nor are the samples of populations studied sufficient in size

to be considered thoroughly representative of the races compared. Yet there is significance in the fact of the "remarkable uniformity of the results obtained by many investigators working with different localities." All seem to indicate that "the negro, viewed as a race, falls below most of the white stocks with which he has been compared in this country, both as regards his average attainment and as regards the frequency with which he produces individuals of superior powers." [1] Even if this tentative conclusion should be more definitely established, however, it would still remain probable that the great body of the negro population is on the same plane or level of capacity of the mass as the white population — neither higher nor lower. The difference is to be found in the extremes — the smaller number of the distinctly high grade capacity and the larger number of the low grade, each of these extremes being not numerous in any people compared with the body lying between them. It is probable that in future years the measurement of mental qualities will have gone far enough so that we may know with greater certainty how these two races compare in inborn mental ability. For the present it is natural for the white race to note with some anxiety the mingling of these races and to fear the possible lowering of the mental power of the American people because of it. It may be that the economic effort to provide a cheap labor supply which gave us our slavery problem may work far greater harm through the modification of our blood than could possibly be offset by the economic gain which slave labor gave through production of wealth.

It is an important aspect of the American population problem, however, that the negro rate of increase is slower than that of the whites. The migration of large numbers of negroes from the rural South into both Southern and Northern cities during recent years is accompanied by a high death rate and a decreasing birth rate, so that in Southern cities and in the entire North negro deaths exceed births. "It seems reasonable to anticipate," says W. H. Willcox, "that the negroes which at the first census were over nineteen per

[1] F. H. Hankins in *Publications* of the American Sociological Society, vol. XVII, pp. 38–39. This entire article is suggestive and includes a brief summary of the more important investigations.

cent, or nearly one fifth of the population of the country, and now are about one tenth, are likely by the end of the century to be not more than one twentieth." [1]

White race varieties. The mingling of the varying white peoples from Europe presents a different and less striking problem of racial inheritance. Yet it needs careful consideration. It is common to classify the European sub-races as Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean. The early colonists in America came from western Europe and were mainly of the Nordic stock. The English, German, and Scandinavian groups were, except for the Irish, the important elements in our people until comparatively recent years. The Irish are of mixed ancestry of the Nordic, Mediterranean, and Alpine sub-races; while the Germans combine Alpine and Nordic strains. The English and Scandinavians are more nearly straight Nordic. Since about 1875, however, there has been a rapid influx of peoples from central and southern Europe: Italians, Greeks, Jews, and varied Slavic groups. These are either of Mediterranean race — as the South Italians — or the Alpine race to which the central European immigrants largely belong. The numbers of these latter immigrant groups are very great and have increased rapidly, so that we can no longer think of America as predominantly English or even West European in origin. The volume of the 'new immigration' is not merely bringing a variety of strange tongues and alien customs; it is bringing new and strange blood. That this blood is inferior to the blood of earlier America we do not know, though it is at least possible that races are not mentally equal in endowment. But it is certainly to be expected that as the newer groups intermarry with the older there will result a different stock, gifted with a somewhat different combination of qualities.

It is probably fair to say that never before in the history of the world has there been such a mingling of diverse peoples as is taking place in America. The opportunity to measure mental ability and to select the stronger rather than the weaker should not be neglected, in the light of whatever knowledge we now have or may reach in coming years.

Problems of racial purity and inequality. Nevertheless, great

[1] W. H. Willcox: *Second International Congress of Eugenics*, vol. II, p. 173.

caution is necessary in drawing conclusions upon the whole race problem. The separate peoples of Europe are not racially distinct one from another, nor do they bring to our shores 'pure' race qualities. Ethnologists agree that there are no pure races in Europe, but all nationalities are thoroughly intermingled, racially speaking. Dr. Boas states this fact clearly as follows:[1]

Race enthusiasts who are proud of being members of the Northwest European race, or nationalists who dwell on the excellencies of the Latin or Teutonic race, would do well to consider that there is no such thing as that racial purity which stimulates their emotional life. In times past England, with its tall, blond, blue-eyed stock, has been overrun by groups of very divergent social characteristics. There was a prehistoric immigration of an unnamed people of a quite distinctive type. Then there was an invasion of Celtic people from France, followed by the Roman conquest and still later by waves of immigration from various parts of Northern Europe. All these elements have contributed to the modern population of the British Isles.

In another way the French who pride themselves on their national characteristics are racially composed of entirely distinctive elements. In the north we find a prevalence of tall, blond, long-headed Northwest Europeans. In central France we find people who show the same characteristics as Bavarians and other South Germans. In the south are people who according to their traits should be classed with the South Italians. Analogous conditions prevail in Italy. There is no Italian race. The North Italians belong with the Swiss, Bavarians, Bohemians, and Austrians. The South Italians are akin to the people of Southern Spain and Greece. There is no German race. The North Germans resemble in type the Scandinavians and English. The South Germans are of the same type as their enemies, the Central French and the Czechs.

In other words, in practically every nation there is a mixture of different types that in some cases intermingle and scatter through the whole country. In other regions the diverse racial groups inhabit different parts of the country, while all participate in the same culture.

Moreover, the scientific evidence of the superior ability of the immigrants to America from one race compared with another is very slight and is in serious dispute. It is not at all clear either that the supposed characteristic mental traits of one of these races as compared with another are inborn; more than likely they are the result of the separate history of each of the differing peoples, as influenced

[1] *The World To-morrow* (January, 1923), p. 5.

by their varying physical environments. Even supposedly fixed physical characteristics seem to suffer modification under varying environments, so that what are considered the distinctive gifts and defects of one or another race may turn out to be not inborn traits at all, but elements of their social heritage or culture. Certainly the vigorous and unrestrained assertions of the superiority of the Nordic stock as compared to the Mediterranean and Alpine stocks, which are characteristic of a number of recent books upon the race problem, are greatly exaggerated. They are marked by prejudice and an inflamed imagination rather than by scientific caution. The results of the tests applied to certain numbers of the American army during the Great War are most usually drawn upon to prove the inferior inborn capacity of the recent immigrant groups. These results seem to indicate that the average intelligence of the later immigrants is lower than that of the earlier groups; but the numbers examined were not large, and even if those selected were typical of the entire immigrant groups in the United States, these groups may not be typical of the peoples and races which they represent. Moreover, it is probable that the tests used are not exclusively measures of inborn capacity, since educational and other social factors are not eliminated.[1] Too little is known at present in regard to race qualities to make it wise to base public policy upon race discrimination. If the American stock is to be improved or prevented from deterioration in inborn quality it must be mainly through a policy of comparison and sifting of individuals without reference to race. That is, it is probably a problem primarily of the exclusion of individuals rather than the exclusion of whole races.[2]

READING REFERENCES

Boas, F.: *The Mind of Primitive Man*, chs. I, II, and X.
Chapin, F. S.: *Social Evolution*, ch. VII.
Dixon, R.: *The Racial History of Man*, pp. 3–23; 475–523.
Kelsey, C.: *The Physical Basis of Society*, ch. VII.
Kroeber, A. L.: *Anthropology*, chs. III and IV.
Lowie, R. H.: *Culture and Ethnology*, pp. 5–46.

[1] See Carl C. Brigham: *A Study of American Intelligence*, for a careful examination of the results of the army tests, but with exaggeration of the racial aspects.

[2] Cf. Kroeber: *Anthropology*, ch. IV.

Ripley, W. Z.: *Races of Europe*, pp. 103–30; 453–85.
Ross, E. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 59–73.
Wells, H. G.: *Outlines of History*, ch. XIII.

QUESTIONS

1. What ideas about race distinctions do you find in the community you know best? Are these distinctions physical or mental? Do the ideas rest upon carefully tested knowledge, or are they unscientific guesses?
2. What different physical marks seem to be associated together in a single group? Is it evident that certain mental characteristics accompany these physical marks?
3. Distinguish 'race' from 'nation.' In the statement, "The migration of the Italian race to America began in the 'seventies,'" is the word 'race' properly used?
4. Are the marks of race a part of original (or biological) heredity or of 'acquired nature'? What about national marks or characteristics?
5. In what way is it supposed that race marks became fixed in a particular group of people?
6. What is meant by a 'pure' race? Are any existing races pure?
7. What is meant by race prejudice? Does constant intermingling of races intensify or diminish it?

CHAPTER VI

ACQUIRED HUMAN NATURE

We have been discussing those phases of human life which are inborn and constitute human nature at birth. But it is not difficult to see that this is only a beginning of the description of human nature. The varied inborn impulses to action are constantly being directed, regulated, encouraged or repressed either through intervention of reflective decision or more commonly through the mass of habits which gradually from earliest infancy are developing in each of us. Habits [1] are the great developing element in human nature. They are not 'original,' that is, inborn; they are acquired in connection with the varied experiences which each one undergoes. Not only do they modify and direct the instinctive tendencies to action, but also they become the foundation of interests and motives, so that much of what men do and feel is the result not so much of original instinct as of the interests which acquired habits set up in them.

Habit as socially developed human nature. Interstimulation. It should be kept clearly in mind that habits are not inherited. Only the original or inborn is carried in inheritance from parent to child. Yet habits, though variable, are very similar among masses of people; if they are not the result of a common inheritance, how then are they so much alike? To answer this question it is only necessary to observe that first, instincts are not adequate to direct human action because not only do they constantly conflict with each other but they bring conflict between man and man. The formation of habits which modify and control the expression of instinct is within group life. Habits are acquired by each largely through imitation of others, the child from his elders or his companions. The individual is not an isolated atom; his experiences through which his habits are formed are in the main group experi-

[1] 'Habits,' as here used, is intended to cover not only actions, but feeling and thought.

ences, and are the result of his adjustment to the life about him. The environment within which man lives is not so much a geographic or natural one as it is a human and social one; and the process of adjustment by which he lives is a process of acquiring those habits which aid in that social process. This is to say that while there is a variety of inborn impulses in man, he is constantly acquiring through contact with his fellow-men those habits which constitute their social heritage and which come to characterize him. All the organized social life about him not only gives him the field within which his impulses shall act, but this social life gradually enters his life, directing it, controlling it, forming it, until it becomes quite impossible at a given moment to say what is inborn and what is habit resulting from social contact.

Physiologically, habits are the development of paths of discharge in the nervous system. Just as a gully washed down a hillside makes a path through which succeeding storms will more easily empty themselves; so nervous discharge along a definite line becomes a path through which the next discharge more readily passes into action.

Socially speaking, habit is the making of regular responses to stimuli, mainly through contact with other human beings. If these habits are valuable it is because they are suitable responses, in the sense that through them we are better enabled to act in conjunction with other lives. Therefore just as it is vitally important both to the individual and to society what his inborn nature is, so it is equally important what habits he acquires. The inborn impulses drive one, they make him restless to act, they are like irritants that will not let him be passive and inert. But the road he shall take, the particular action into which the restless impulse shall explode is the expression of the acquired paths in the nervous system and which are habits set up and fixed during the passage of years through interaction with one's associates in the organized relationships of society.

Habit and growth. Moreover, the formation of habit is conditioned by age. The child mind is plastic. The expression or direction of its inborn tendencies is vague: new nerve paths may readily be formed and old ones obliterated. But as years pass the mind

becomes more settled; fixity takes the place of plasticity. The system of one's life is more and more established; the interrelations of its parts has become more intricate. In the irrigated orchard a hoe will change the ditch as the water first winds its way among the trees; but only a tremendous power can turn the great river from its bed formed by the wearing of the water through ages of time. Perhaps a better illustration may be found in the network of a railway system. At the beginning of its construction there may have been several possible directions which might be taken and lines which might be built. But as years pass the line which has finally been constructed becomes interrelated with other lines and with the growth of business connections; it is now a part of a complex, connected system, and to change fundamentally its direction or character involves the cutting to pieces of the whole system of which it is a part. So the human life in the process of growth becomes a complex system, its varied impulsive tendencies interwoven with each other, the relationships and interests of society interknit in its mental organization, resulting in a pattern as in a carpet — beautiful or ugly — but fixed and definite. To change one's habits is to change the whole pattern of one's life. For this reason is it that all who, for any reason, have had an interest in the life of the young have felt the weight of the importance of the making of right habits in the plastic period of childhood and youth.

Relation of habit to inborn nature. In studying the control of impulse through habit it is wise both for the individual and society to realize that the direction of inborn tendencies does not mean their destruction or entire suppression. These inborn tendencies are like a pre-arranged 'set' toward action; they are deeply embedded 'drives' which refuse to be neglected. As a consequence wherever economic or social arrangements have refused to recognize these inborn drives disaster has followed. In the formation of habits, therefore, society should recognize that the great interests of human life must find opportunity for expression and that habits can be healthful only when founded upon them. The child's inborn tendency to play needs direction, but if thwarted and suppressed altogether is likely to end in delinquency, vice, or apathy. The impulsive tendencies give vigor to action and develop individual

interest. But it is possible to gain these values of vigor and power and interest by substituting one method of expression for another. The boy gang tendencies — an inborn situation — may lead to criminal activities, but under wise social guidance, as in organized team-play, may lead to the wholesome development of the spirit of coöperation and the habit of fair play.

Typical habits as illustrations. Illustrations of habits which society is (at least at times) wisely interested in its members acquiring may be suggested for consideration. The habits of order and discipline have usually been considered valuable because they enable one to work with his fellows. The methods by which society has attempted to develop discipline as a habit-system have often been utterly wrong. It has been inclined to use force and punishment, in entire disregard of the little-understood facts of human nature and its growth. Instead of appealing to or arousing interests it has whipped or imprisoned. Nevertheless it is clear that discipline in life is essential to the welfare of men in society, and the effort to build intelligently habits of order and self-control is important and vital in society's education of its members.

In the same way society is interested in having its members develop habits of initiative and of decision. The apathetic and drifting individual is of little value to society, and while initiative and decision may be partly inborn, undoubtedly to some extent they are matters of habit and so may be acquired.

Possibly more important than any of the habits already mentioned is the habit of taking an intelligent interest in life, or what is often called the habit of the open mind. It is the danger of habits that they make life fixed and unyielding, and the more thoroughly established they become the more difficult it is to modify or redirect the life of the individual, no matter how great the need and wisdom of change. It is in the very nature of habit that the mind tends to become closed to new lines of suggestion and effort, the result being a gradual but increasing failure to adapt one's self to the changes in the life about one. The only way through which this inevitable danger of habit can be avoided or limited is by building the tendency to open-mindedness itself into a habit. To be alert and to find an interest in the unknown and the untried, to refuse

either to condemn or to be uninterested in ideas and activities of which we have no knowledge, to keep the mind fresh and eager and questioning, rather than set and narrow and prejudiced by our past — this is at least in part itself a matter of habit-training, through which is contributed to the society and the individual values of the highest order.

Summary. Thus the essential basis of acquired human nature is the social environment surrounding each life. The individual experience is gained in the processes of adjustment to his fellow-men; habits or acquired nature are dependent upon the character of this social environment. Out of the past, the product of its inventions and discoveries, its conflicts, its contacts, has grown a people's history — its social heritage. This becomes both the limiting and the directing basis of the acquired nature of the individual. The character-forming groups are principally the social-interest groups, such as are found in the family, industry, politics, play, education, and religion. The habits or acquired nature which are formed are judged as valuable in so far as they react favorably toward the welfare of these groups. Society in its many group relations is thus the builder of individual tendencies to behavior in regard to such relationships as those of the sexes and of parents and children; or those tendencies which have to do with work, its value, quality, and place in life. It is in the school and through other educational groups that habits of thought, of attack upon knowledge, of creative interest in knowledge and regard for truth, are developed; and it is the recreation or play groups — family, neighborhood, school, street corner, saloon, picture show, playground — which are the builders of taste and appreciations which so largely control and either spoil or enrich the leisure life. So also, participation in political or religious group life forms and directs habits and behavior in these aspects of life and culture. Improvement in any of these various phases of individual character must come through the modification of these groups and their customs and ways; for habits and so characters are made in group life; groups develop their own means and standards of activity; in the long run, changing the activity, the standards and judgments of the group life is the method by which the quality of behavior of each individual is made better or worse.

READING REFERENCES

Cooley, C. H.: *Human Nature and the Social Order.*
Cooley, C. H.: "Heredity and Instinct"; in *The Survey*, January 1, 1923.
Dewey, J.: *Human Nature and Conduct.*
Edman, I.: *Human Traits*, chs. II and III.
Hobson, J. A.: *Problems of a New World*, ch. V.
James, W.: *Psychology, Briefer Course*, ch. X.
James, W.: *Habit.*
James, W.: *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, ch. VIII.
Robinson, J. H.: *Mind in the Making*, ch. III.

QUESTIONS

1. Explain clearly what aspects of life are included under the term 'habit.'
2. Comparing original and acquired human nature, answer each of the following questions by yes or no:
   (a) Is one's language due to his original nature?
   (b) Is one's social position due to his original nature?
   (c) Is sympathy with suffering due to original nature?
   (d) Is giving aid to starving German children an expression of original nature?
   (e) Is response to rhythm due to original nature?
   (f) Is a liking for 'classical' music due to original nature?

CHAPTER VII

CERTAIN DEGENERATIVE HABITS

In thinking of habit as representing the acquired tendencies toward action which become fixed in the individual character and which give direction to the inborn tendencies and impulses, attention must be directed to the fact that habits may fashion character along evil lines as well as good. Individual habits are formed in the main as the result of the associations made in group life; and if such associations are on a low plane, the habits formed are likely, through imitation, to be evil or degenerative. Moreover they are as strongly set and dominate life as thoroughly as though they were better habits. Certain habits, resulting from group associations in the main, are so widespread and have so seriously evil consequences both to the individual and to society that they have led to wide discussion and serious social action. Among them brief consideration may be given to the liquor habit, the drug habit, and gambling.

Liquor habit and social welfare. The tendency to use alcoholic liquors is old and widespread. The habit of one people tends to emphasize the use of one liquor rather than another, so that we can speak of the Italians as wine-drinkers, the Russians as vodka-drinkers, and the Germans as beer-drinkers. And some peoples drink much more heavily than others. On the whole it seems to be true that the Northern European peoples drink more heavily than the Southern, and the habit of drunkenness is more common among them. In comparatively recent years a growing opposition to the drinking habit has developed in both Europe and America. This is probably due both to moral and economic reasons and to the growth of scientific knowledge in regard to the ill effects of the use of alcohol. The increasing use of machinery in industry, together with the growing complexity of our social life, tends to put a premium upon reliability, alertness, and steadiness. It is found that alcohol weakens the activity of the higher brain centers upon which

self-control depends; as a consequence managers of industry who must face responsibility for industrial accident have come to be unwilling to employ men who use alcoholic drinks. The railroad systems of the United States were among the first industrial plants to adopt this point of view, and the movement has spread to various other types of industrial establishments. In the Great War the world saw for the first time the definite abandonment of the long-accepted belief that the courage, good cheer, and determination of armies — their morale — must be aided by, or even built upon, the use of alcoholic stimulants. The unexpectedly rapid mobilization of the Russian army, as compared to its slow and uncertain organization at the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War, is attributed to the abolition of the sale of vodka. In any case it is evident that the interdependence of men upon each other, in our complex life, has led to a change in opinion about the reasonableness of the drink habit.

A change in moral standards has also come about. The plea of the right of the individual to do as he pleases has had to yield before a growing accumulation of evidence as to the harmful social consequences of drinking; and the experiments of scientific laboratories have yielded a large amount of evidence of the destructiveness to individual quality and to life itself.

Two main aspects of the problem stand out: one is the problem of the individual and his relation to the drinking habit and to society; the other is the problem of the saloon as a social institution. We should not consider the saloon phase of the problem at this point in our study were it not for the fact that habits, as has been said, are formed in relation to the social life about the individual. The saloon provided a group environment which suggested the drinking habit, and through imitation of the life of the saloon the drink habit was easily formed.

Alcohol and degeneracy. The first aspect of the consumption of alcoholic liquors is the problem of the wisdom of the wide use of a drug which is likely to have harmful social consequences. Scientific study, principally in Europe, has proved beyond a question that alcohol is a drug, and that its action is harmful both to muscles and nerves. Its effect upon bodily health is known to be bad.

Muscular power is decreased, the capacity for exertion is diminished, ability to endure exposure is weakened. Athletes know today that the use of alcohol is a source of weakness. Dr. Richard Cabot, of Boston, writing in a bulletin published by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, says, "If a man wishes to become an athlete and to go into training, the first thing his trainer would tell him would be to cut out alcohol absolutely." Alcohol is recognized as a predisposing condition of tuberculosis, and is an important cause of deaths from heart disease, Bright's disease, diseases of the arteries and of the liver, and other diseases of the body.

Of far greater importance, however, is the effect of alcohol in regard to insanity and the diseased condition of the mind. Dr. Rosanoff in a careful summary of the problem reached the following conclusion: "We are very near the truth if we say that throughout the western world one out of four men admitted to an insane asylum is brought there by alcohol";[1] while Kraepelin records as the evidence from his famous clinic at Munich that "from ten to thirty per cent of all mental illness is due to the use of alcohol."

The result of scientific study has thus established beyond question the great harm to body and mind which is involved in the drinking habit. The very great value of health of body and mind, not only to the individual, but to the nation and to society as a whole, makes this a matter of grave concern, and, precisely as a community must guard itself against the destructive effect of smallpox or typhoid fever, so it must take measures to prevent the loss of vigor through the use of alcohol. Just as no argument based on the supposed liberty of the individual to do as he pleases is valid in the face of the spread of a contagious disease, so no similar argument in regard to individual liberty in reference to alcoholic consumption is justified in the face of the social danger involved in the drink habit.

The social danger involved becomes more evident if certain problems of social deterioration be noted. The relation of alcohol to crime is now well established. The often-quoted report of the Committee of Fifty in its study of 13,402 persons found in prisons and reformatories, states that in thirty-seven per cent the use of alco-

[1] *McClure's Magazine* (April, 1907), p. 505.

hol was the prime cause of their criminality. The Massachusetts Commission on Drunkenness, in its report issued in 1914, holds that "at least one third of all crime (aside from public drunkenness itself) is directly occasioned by the use of alcohol." Aschaffenburg, one of the best-known criminologists of Germany, says [1] that in the examination of prison populations he has found that in at least fifty per cent of the serious crime of Germany the use of alcohol is an important causative factor. In a similar way the evidence is abundant and trustworthy that alcohol is a large factor in the production of pauperism, of child destitution and of dependency, of divorce, and other social ills. For this reason, because of the great danger and the enormous expense to society in both money and physical and mental vigor we have come to recognize the great and growing need of the self-protection of society through the control of the use of alcohol. The matter, so far, may be summed up in the announcement made by Kraepelin, one of the greatest alienists of the world, as the result of experience and direct experiment: "alcohol is a great factor in human degeneration." First it impairs every human faculty. The higher and more complex the human faculty, the more pronounced the effect of alcohol. And the effects are cumulative, that is, its continuous use impairs the faculties at an increasing rate. The effect of alcoholic consumption is thus — particularly as intoxication is reached — to weaken the powers of inhibition or control and to cloud the judgment through its paralysis of the higher and more recently evolved brain centers, thus releasing the more brutal and intense lower animal passions. Yet this is an age in which the close and complex interrelationships of mankind make judgment and control more necessary than ever before. Hence the need of social control of the problem in defense of social welfare.

The saloon problem. The second aspect of the drink habit is its relation to the saloon. Whatever else it may have been, the saloon has been essentially a social institution for the satisfaction of social impulses under the stimulation of alcohol. Men went to the saloon for social intercourse and for stimulation. The saloon developed a group or social environment into which the individual came and in

[1] *Crime and its Repression*, ch. I.

whose atmosphere his habits were formed or developed. The alcohol habit was very largely the outgrowth of the life and suggestion of the saloon as a social environment. Not only was this the case in general, but the enormous financial profits to be made from the saloon as a business, particularly since the cheapening of the processes of production in comparatively recent times, led to the use of a great variety of means to develop and strengthen drinking habits to increase consumption. Thus, in the face of a growing need to develop judgment and self-control in industrial and social life, and in the face of the growing knowledge of the pernicious effect of the alcohol habit, saloons were rapidly multiplied and their organization for the purpose of spreading the drink habit became more thorough and systematic. So far did this go that the fear of loss of its position and commercial profit led to the entrance of the saloon into politics, and every State legislature was likely to have its liquor lobby, and city governments, particularly police departments, have too often been subject to corruption and domination by the liquor interests as represented by the saloon. Thus it may be stated in summary: the drink habit as a source of harm and weakness to the individual and of serious and costly social evils, has been greatly developed and strengthened by the saloon. In spite of possible social values it became a builder of evil habits leading to serious social danger.

Methods of social control. The effort of society to control the drink habit has taken many forms, such as licensing saloons subject to legal restrictions; the direct sale by government as a regulating monopoly; local option or the vote by localities to forbid the sale of liquor within their own areas; prohibition by entire States; and ultimately the passage in 1919 of an amendment to the Federal Constitution of the United States, forbidding the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. The problem of the enforcement of this prohibition is a serious one, but there is strong reason to believe that as time goes on the drink habit which grew in the social atmosphere of the saloon will be weakened and far fewer young persons will form such habits in the absence of that social environment. Certainly the need for control is so great that every citizen should be eager to aid in giving the experiment of this new law

and constitutional provision the best opportunity to show its real possibilities for social welfare.

The drug habit. The drug habit is somewhat similar to the liquor habit in its characteristic effects, though swifter and more certain to be serious in its deteriorating consequences. It is, however, not nearly so widespread, though there is evidence that the habit is rapidly growing. Morphine, cocaine, and heroin are the most usual drugs used. They are taken to dull pain or to stimulate the imagination. Quickly these effects disappear and the drug addict soon degenerates. Bodily breakdown is accompanied by weakening of the will and loss of both mental and moral tone. Moreover, the habit is very quickly formed and dependence upon the drug is soon established. Many types of men and women fall victims to the habit. They soon constitute a distinct menace — as criminals or degenerates — to the welfare of society. Most States have passed laws forbidding the sale of such drugs except by order of physicians for specific need. The United States has also passed a law of the same character. Nevertheless, it is difficult to enforce such laws because of the lack of general knowledge in regard to the danger involved, and also because it is easy to smuggle such drugs from person to person without detection.

The gambling habit. One other habit of a different character may be briefly considered. This is the gambling habit. The evil of this habit to the gambler himself is not difficult to observe. It leads him to substitute chance for service to society as a method of enrichment. Its consequences are, however, much more serious than this; society itself is a serious sufferer from the widespread gambling habit. Society suffers because gambling substitutes for the usual principle of commercial life — exchange of values — the principle of taking something for nothing. There are three sources of individual income in society: work, gift, and theft. Gambling in its economic aspect is not based upon production by work nor exchange of values; neither is it an expression of desire to give. Rather is it similar in nature to theft. "Whatever money or other property any man wins, some one else loses; by as much as he is enriched, some one else is impoverished; for all that he has got in gambling, he has given no equivalent." This is utterly subversive

to society; it is thoroughly contrary to the possibility of an honest social organization. Washington Gladden[1] in discussing this problem quotes the following statement from *The Study of Sociology*, by Herbert Spencer, who is pointing out how little the evil of gambling is understood even by moralists who discuss it:

> Listen to a conversation about gambling, and when reprobation is expressed, note the grounds of the reprobation: that it tends to ruin the gambler; that it risks the welfare of family and friends; that it alienates from business and leads into bad company — these and such as these are the reasons given for condemning the practice. Rarely is gambling condemned because it is a kind of gratification by which pleasure is obtained at the cost of pain to another. . . . Benefit received does not imply effort put forth; and the happiness of the winner involves the misery of the loser. This kind of action is, therefore, essentially anti-social.

The spread of family poverty is an evident result of the gambling habit. Worse probably is the breakdown of steady and regular habits of industry, and the accumulation of a growing number of gamblers who live on society as parasites just as truly as do thieves. If all members of society were to turn gamblers, society would be destroyed in a short time. As a consequence it is unfortunate that society is not more definite in its condemnation of this habit, though there are various Federal and State laws forbidding it. It is highly important that men and women should understand clearly the nature of the gambling habit and the seriousness of the evil to society.

READING REFERENCES

Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, ch. xxxiv.
Gillin, J. L.: *Poverty and Dependency*, ch. xxiv.
Gladden, W.: *Applied Christianity*, pp. 182–97.
Kelynack, T. N.: *The Drink Problem.*
Koren, J.: *Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem.*
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work (1920), pp. 231–35.
Warner, A. G.: *American Charities*, chs. iii and iv.
Warner, H. S.: *Social Welfare and the Liquor Problem.*
Williams, H. S.: *Alcohol.*

[1] *Applied Christianity*, p. 201.

QUESTIONS

1. Is there a difference between the money cost of the liquor habit and the 'social cost'? What items make up the latter?
2. Has every one a 'right' to eat or drink what he pleases? If you think so, explain where he gets this right — that is, its basis?
3. What is known about the relation (if any exists) between heredity and the use of alcohol? (Read Holmes, S. J.: *The Trend of the Race*, ch. XII.)
4. What relation can be observed between the growth of modern industry and the development of public opinion against the use of alcohol?
5. What has been the history of 'the saloon in politics?'
6. What is the legal status of the prohibition movement in the United States?
7. Is the growth of the 'drug habit' a more serious menace to society than the liquor habit? Give reasons.

CHAPTER VIII

HABIT AS CULTURE

THUS far habit has been discussed primarily in its individual aspects. But in a large sense the making of habit is far more than an individual problem. The acquired life of individuals is seen to reflect the social life or culture. The type and quality of the social organization of a people is the constant unconscious educational basis of individual development. Only within the variable limits of this culture is a variation in individual habits likely to take place. There is, therefore, the directly social aspect of the problem of habit to be considered.

The organized associative life or culture. A society is made possible and is characterized by a system of life, called by anthropologists, its culture. In surveying the elements which are brought to light as necessary to the existence of society and as helping to the explanation of it, we have briefly considered geography, biological facts found in population as such, inborn psychological nature of the individual, and the acquired or habit aspect of individual human nature. But what of the content of social life itself? Is it not missing the most vital aspect of the problem to describe external factors like geography, or facts of individual nature, but to neglect consideration of the causative power of society itself in making society what it is? Using the term 'culture' to describe the associated organized life of a society, it can be truly said that that which binds a people together into a society is its culture; that which characterizes it as distinct from another society is its culture; that which causes it to hold the status or position it occupies is the quality of its culture; and that which determines its culture is a series of previous or earlier steps or incidents in the development of its culture. Geography, biology, and psychology are conditioning or limiting factors, but the really controlling or guiding influences are to be found in the character and incidents of the culture life itself. To illustrate: our modern life in Europe and America is

centered in cities and cities are built about machines driven by steam. The steam engine is thus at the heart of the technological phases of our culture. This great change from an earlier agricultural-village and small-town hand-tool culture is not to be explained by modification in geography nor in inborn capacity. The Greeks had a steam engine ages before its use in England. The real explanation of this great change in culture or the system of social life lies in the conjunction of a series of culture facts, such as new contacts of peoples leading to an expanded market or demand for goods, exclusion of numbers of laborers from the land, thus furnishing a manufacturing labor supply, previous development of banking which could become a source of credit, and other similar well-known incidents in industrial history. The Greek steam engine did not become an element in Greek culture; the English steam engine did enter and dominate English culture; and the difference is explained by facts found in the evolution of culture itself.

Thus it is evident that society and its life is not simply a number of individuals. These individuals themselves are what they are because they are a part of a particular society. The most important terms in explanation of society as we find it at any time are invention and diffusion. Invention might seem to be a purely individual factor due to inborn ability, yet while inborn ability is essential to invention, still inventions are cumulative, one resting upon another. Whether the essential previous conditions for the next step in invention are present or not is an aspect of culture history. Moreover, diffusion or contact of minds — a social fact — is equally a factor in invention. The supposition that first we have a fortunate invention due to genius and then it is spread through imitation, is far from true to fact. Diffusion of a phase of culture is itself a basis for further invention. The Constitution of the United States is sometimes called an invention, but is accounted for only because its varied parts were already at work in the culture life of England. Many inventions in legal mechanism are credited to England; yet they rest for their possibility upon the Roman law spread by conquest over what is now western Europe.

The biological life-cycle. It may illustrate the meaning and significance of the organization of society into habit-systems or cul-

tures, to compare it with animal life in regard to what is called by biologists the life-cycle.[1] In the animal world and so in the human individual there is the regular movement of birth, growth and development, and death. This cycle seems to be fixed in the nature of the animal organism, and while each step is subject to variation within limits, the steps are definite and certain. In a similar way, apparently, societies, historically considered, seem frequently to have a life-cycle. To be sure, birth is obscure and death has not always followed, yet many a society has passed through stages of youth, through growth and development to extinction or death as an independent society. Consequently, there has been a frequent tendency to explain, for instance, the 'death' of societies as an inevitable, logical fact, determined by the inborn nature and so certain to occur, though it may be hastened or postponed by special conditions, as is also true of animal life. But the similarity is only superficial and entirely illusory, because the chief factors that determine social organization from its immaturity to its strength and, at times, to its decay lie in the character of that organization itself. They are not biological and inborn; they are social and acquired. The decay of societies is never fixed in the individual inborn life, but is found in the type and character of its social habits and culture — the quality of its civilization. Decay of society is social, not biological; only secondarily and as an effect of social decay is it individual. In the same way the strength of society is a social fact, not a biological fact, and since social organization is not inborn but acquired, social strength is extremely variable; in no sense is it fixed or settled in the inborn nature. Therefore there really is no such thing as a definite life-cycle for societies. They do not inevitably decay because of inherent tendencies. Some of them decay and others continue to live, development succeeding development. Social contact of one people with another, leading to diffusion, invention and consequent changing technique, and new varieties of coöperation are suggestive terms in regard to the explanation of social development or decay; while terms descriptive of inborn individual animal nature have only an indirect explanatory significance.

The dominating feature of social life is thus the developing cul-

[1] Cf. for example, Jordan and Kellogg: *Animal Life*, ch. v.

ture itself. On the basis of an unchanged geography and, within historic time, at least, an unchanged inborn human capacity, quite contrasting societies are reared — one age differing markedly from another. Undoubtedly we must look for explanation of such a fact to the steps in the making of the social organization itself. We must ask such questions as what other peoples have touched this people, what conflicts have driven it to find new types of organization, how have contacts affected the size of its population and thereby its possibility of specialization in occupation, and how was brought to it an element of knowledge on the basis of which an invention was possible. Social institutions and traditions, making the social heritage of society constitute the most important series of causes of society itself. Societies are what they are primarily because of ages of acquired social or culture history.

READING REFERENCES

Dewey, J.: *Human Nature and Conduct.*
Wissler, C.: *Man and Culture,* chs. VI, XI, XII.
Lowie, R. H.: *Culture and Ethnology.*
Kroeber, A. L.: *Anthropology,* ch. XV.
Ellwood, C. A.: "Mental Patterns in Social Evolution"; in *Publications* of the American Sociological Society, vol. XVII.
Ellwood, C. A.: "Modificability of Human Nature and Human Institutions"; in *Journal of Applied Sociology,* vol. VII, no. 5.

PART II
THE BUILDING OF SOCIAL LIFE

CHAPTER IX

COMMUNICATION[1]

Communication the basis of society. The existence of communities depends upon communication. To be able to communicate with each other gives those who do so the basis of a 'common' life. 'Communication,' 'community,' life 'in common' — these expressions all have something of the same significance. Mountain barriers which encircle communities and fence them off from contact with other people or kinds of life prevent communication and thus make impossible the enlargement of the common life so as to include in it peoples beyond the mountains. Seclusion of immigrant women in the home and by home duties makes it difficult for them to have any share in the life of the country to which they have come, because they are unable to communicate with that life. In general it is safe to say that all group life is made possible by communication between its members, and the methods of communication, as they have been developed and modified from time to time, have much to do with determining the size and character of the group and its life. Communication is the basis of understanding, and the lack of it in some one or more of its forms is, so far, an interference with the possibility of men coöperating together, since coöperation and group life depend on understanding.

Communication is the process of bringing minds together, and the barriers which stand in the way of communication are not merely physical, they are primarily mental. Education is, in a large way, the removal of barriers which separate minds. Ignorance is itself the most formidable obstacle to the contact of mind with mind; it is the basis of misunderstanding and the foundation of prejudice. Prevention of misunderstanding and conquest of prejudice is made possible only through better means of understanding, that is, of bringing minds into relation with each other by adequate communication.

[1] The author is greatly indebted to Professor Cooley for his clear analysis of Communication, found in his *Social Organization*.

Forms of communication. It is wise to ask one's self the question, 'What difference would it make in the life of our society if some important form of communication were lacking?' To do this it is necessary first to enumerate the important means of communication, and then to try to see how they change or influence the formation of group life.

Undoubtedly the most important form of communication is language. This is at first oral or spoken in form, and it is only as one discovery has been added to another that language has come to be written, then printed, and then carried through space by means of telegraph, telephone, or 'wireless.' To language should be added photography and the phonograph. Painting, sculpture, and music are also means of communication of great importance, in that they embody and preserve the thought and emotions of artists and carry them to the observer, who is thus brought into touch with the ideals of the artist and the social life which lies behind them. Communication is self-expression, but what shall be expressed and how well it shall be done depends to a great extent upon the means of expression. A people whose language is oral only and contains perhaps but a few hundred words, will be able to express to each other only a few ideas and will be able to communicate but slightly with succeeding generations; while a highly developed language with a large vocabulary, and one which is written as well as spoken, becomes the medium of a wide range of ideas; through it generation after generation is able to come in contact with the past and so to enlarge its experience and its life.

It is perhaps easiest to see the social importance of such improvements in communication in the case of the invention of printing. Briefly, printing made possible the spread of knowledge over an entire people. Before its invention, scientific knowledge was the possession of the few. It was useless for most men to learn to read, because the cost of books, which must be laboriously written by hand, made them luxuries attainable by the well-to-do alone. The invention of printing cheapened books, thus spreading knowledge throughout the whole population. On this basis people of varied ranks may come to have a common body of ideas, and people remote from each other in space may know each what the others

are thinking about. In this way common knowledge leads to communication. It is probable, therefore, that the invention of printing is the most important step in the movement toward democracy.

It has been well said that modern democratic governments are possible only as a consequence of the modern means of communication. This means simply that it would be impossible to develop a public opinion or to record its expression with reference to a vast nation such as the United States, without such means of communication as the press, the telegraph and telephone, and the postal service using the steam railway, steamship, and automobile.

What would be the effect on the business of a city if there were no telephone and every message from one part of the city to another had to be carried by a messenger? What change in the growth of wheat on American farms would result if there were no telegraph or cable to make possible a common price and market over the world? To analyze such questions is a useful exercise in that it helps us to realize how vital the varied means of communication are in the formation of the life of communities and of the world.

The forms of communication which have been mentioned are direct in their action. They bring minds immediately into touch with each other. There are also means of communication which are less direct but which are equally important and necessary to the formation of group organization. Primarily these are means of transportation which carry goods and men. The steam engine opened not only a new era in the material world; it brought about the enlargement of markets and the uniting of peoples through sharing in new inventions and production. Farm machinery made in America is quickly carried by rail and steamship to Siberia or Russia, and its use in those countries involves a change in the life of the Russian peasant village. Material goods embody ideas, and the interchange of goods is therefore an interchange of ideas. Thus centers of commerce — that is, places of the interchange of goods — tend to become also centers of intense mental activity where varied ideas meet and compete with each other. Changes in the means of transportation, therefore, lead to the spread of new ideas, to the meeting of varied ways or customs, and to new methods of organizing the life of people in communities and in nations.

Primitive peoples were limited to the ox-cart or the drag or the dugout canoe. They moved slowly and could travel but short distances and transport but small quantities of goods. Commerce or the interchange of goods was a matter of slight importance and limited to few goods such as could most easily be carried. In the very nature of things people were bound to live in small groups and each group was more or less isolated and alone. New ideas entered with difficulty and there was little to suggest change or progress.

Compare this condition with the world to-day. The steamship has made the oceans great highways carrying goods and men. Steam and electric railways thread the continents and so interchange the goods and ideas of peoples thousands of miles apart and differing in language, customs, education, and government. The automobile and the building of good roads increases this rapid and continuous stream of goods and of people; and the possibilities of the airship for commercial purposes are yet only barely beginning to be imagined.

With such tremendous modifications in both the direct means of communication and those indirect means which involve transportation, it is not strange that we see to-day a closer contact and mingling of peoples and a wider diffusion of common ideas than the world has ever witnessed before. Customs derived from isolated life and which have lasted for thousands of years are given up in the face of new ways; languages are spread over new continents and others tend to disappear; the rural peasant from the Balkans or Turkey becomes a worker in the vast steel mills of Pittsburgh or the cotton factory of Fall River.

Isolation and diffusion. Two contrasting terms suggest opposing situations which enter into the explanation of the development of societies. These are 'isolation' and 'diffusion.' Anthropologists in recent years have demonstrated the immense significance of diffusion in the transformation of social life. Except for invention it is the great explanation of social modification. Borrowing is characteristic of all peoples; it is in this way that tools, associated ideas about human relations or the relations of men to a supernatural world, languages and literature and art have changed the life not only of the inventing society, but often of quite remote peo-

ples. Contacts of varied kinds through migration, war, exchange, and ceremonial was a constant fact among primitive peoples resulting in the interchange of custom and tradition, and the spread of invention. Within historic time this process has been continuous. The Greeks were great borrowers, probably because of their easy natural opportunity for communication; the sea highways and the land routes led to their door. So the Romans borrowed the Greek ideas — their culture; so the Arabs borrowed and spread the thought and system of life, the social heritage from Greeks and Romans, with elements from other sources.

But while diffusion has always been so vital an aspect of social life, isolation has stood in the way. Isolated groups are out of the current of diffusion, and the result is likely to be stagnation and a stationary life. The mountain peoples of the Appalachian region of the United States show clearly this situation. But one of the striking characteristics of our time is the development of means of communication — that is, ways of enlarging and intensifying social contacts, thus breaking down isolation. Medical schools in China, Western books among the peasants of Syria or the Balkans, suggest why it is that the older culture of these once relatively isolated parts of the world are undergoing rapid change. Diffusion is conquering isolation. As President L. F. Jackson says, in describing the work of the Stanley McCormick School among the hitherto isolated mountain people of North Carolina, "the mountain society is at present above all things else a changing society." In explaining the causes of the change, which he speaks of as a "more rapid change than any other considerable element in the American population," he cites the entrance of lumbering, water-power, and other business concerns, the extensive building of roads, and the aggressive development from without of a program of education. It is very evident that this society which has been isolated is being brought into contact by industry and education with outside social life. Diffusion is taking place in ideas of industry, including money and the exchange of goods in markets instead of family or household economy, in ideas of health, of scientific knowledge, and of government. This spread of new ideas is wiping out illiteracy and breaking down 'provincialism,' the change in this iso-

lated and static society being so rapid as to be 'perilous' to its members.[1]

READING REFERENCES

Bogardus, E. S.: *Introduction to Sociology*, pp. 86–93.
Chapin, F. S.: *Introduction to Social Economy*, ch. XVI.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, part II.
Kroeber, A. L.: *Anthropology*, ch. VIII.
Wissler, C.: *Man and Culture*, chs. VII–XI.

QUESTIONS

1. Describe the changes in society which have come with the development of photography.
2. What are the social aspects of the use of cartoons?
3. Upon what means of communication does the existence of world markets most depend?
4. What invention in the means of communication has been of most importance in making possible the spread of democracy?
5. How do new methods of communication modify geographic isolation? isolation by difference of customs?
6. How has the cheap newspaper affected the life of the day laborer?
7. How was the 'war poster' used and what social service did it perform?
8. Do the modern means of communication tend to reduce or to increase individuality?
   (Read the discussion in Cooley, *Social Organization*, ch. IX.)
9. What social results might be expected if a single language were to be adopted by all peoples?

---

[1] *Journal of Social Forces* (September, 1923), p. 595.

CHAPTER X

MENTAL PROCESSES AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE

Suggestion, imitation, and sympathy. The description of the development and varieties of the means of communication brings before us definite inventions which man has made. But how communication is able to take place at all and what it is that is communicated is dependent upon the nature of the mind. What is transmitted from man to man is a complex mental fact, in which suggestion, imitation, and sympathy are (one or more of them) at the foundation as mental processes. Minds are able to touch each other in these ways. Suggestion refers to the passing of ideas directly from mind to mind; imitation refers to the transfer of motion or activity; and sympathy, to the transfer of a state of emotion or 'feeling.' Imitation and suggestion are often indistinguishable, because idea and action are usually part of one mental process. It is usual, therefore, to refer to the tendency of ideas and actions in one person to pass to another, without the deliberate choice of the latter, as suggestion-imitation. Tarde, the French sociologist, made much of this tendency, believing that it represents the method by which ideas are spread over social life resulting in common action. It has been thought by many students that imitation is an inborn instinct so that imitative action is itself but the working-out of this particular instinct. It seems probable, however, that this is not the case; the various social instincts bring men together, and it is of the nature of ideas to be active — that is, to pass into action — so that suggestion or the transference of ideas is the really fundamental and inborn phase. If sympathy be present also, it heightens the possibility of suggestion; whether or not it is present and in what degree depends at least in part upon likeness or difference in those who sympathize with each other.

It is not difficult to see that large groups are held together through accepting without conscious choice the same ideas and putting them into action. And it is easy also to find illustration of

the binding of groups together through common sympathy. The varied means of communication become the channels of suggestion-imitation and of sympathy.

Suggestion-imitation shows itself at times as fashion, and sometimes as tradition or custom. Fashion arises through the fact that numbers of people alike and without questioning respond to the same idea and one which suggests something new. There is an element of rivalry and the desire for distinction in every fashion, as well as the fact that it is new; and it is swept along over masses of minds through the tendency to accept ideas without criticism. It is thus suggestion and imitation carried along the varied channels of communication — speech, the press, and the like. Thus society has its fashions in dress, and these occur to the mind most readily; but it also has its fashions in speech or language, as witness such war words as *camouflage*, *barrage*, and many others; it has its fashions in art, in poetry, in novels, in slang, in furniture, in courses of study, in houses; indeed, there are few fields of life which are entirely excepted from it. The tendency to question and examine ideas critically is naturally opposed to the sweep of fashion. If this tendency were always in control, society would reject many new ideas and actions because, for example, they are ugly or extravagant or harmful. But any one who looks at the fashions in dress of bygone years must realize that none of these objections have been adequate to prevent their acceptance. Novelty and the love of distinction, together with the tendency of suggestion to be accepted swiftly and without questioning, have been enough to spread a fashion rapidly and widely. Hence those who have goods to sell advertise them, display them, make them known. Fashion thus represents in society a temporary state of mind; it soon passes into a different state, because of the tendency to accept the new; but while a fashion is in favor, it may account for the adoption of a political action or a new attitude in education or industry. For not only, it should be remembered, is the cut of one's clothes governed by fashion, but public opinion is, at least at times, easily swayed by the same considerations.

While it is not so easy to observe the power of suggestion-imitation in the spread of custom as it is in fashion, the conditions

are much alike and the force of custom-imitation is of greater import and power in the making of social life. Custom and tradition represent the tendencies of action and thought to pass from generation to generation. Unlike fashion, custom rules through the prestige of the old and the established; old ways, old beliefs, old arrangements in society gain consideration and command acceptance. Things which are settled and are woven into the arrangements and life of society are easily assumed to be right; as a consequence, children imitate their elders without stopping to question the custom involved, and so, through the channels of social group life, custom is easily suggested and passed by imitation into the continuing life of generation after generation. Nevertheless, it is equally true of custom as of fashion that conduct and ideas need to be thought over critically and weighed carefully by each generation. A custom-bound people tends to be ignorant and unprogressive; its methods, relations, and institutions are sure to be ill-adapted to the needs of an intelligently organized society, since change in underlying conditions is continuous.

On the other hand, sympathy is more easily roused along customary channels. It is, therefore, a stronger bond between people of similar customs, but tends to be narrowed in its value and expression by this very fact. Hence the criticism of custom tends to arouse anger, but in the end may lead to a wider and more intelligent spread of this fundamental social bond which is the basis of so much of the better life of mankind.

Influence as a social fact. What, therefore, stands out in this discussion is the fact that, through the channels of communication which belong to an age or people, the minds and lives of those within any group are subject to the sweep of a common atmosphere; or, to change the figure, they are caught and borne along upon a common current. This constitutes the fundamental fact of 'social influence.' It is spread as surely and as unconsciously as disease; whether one will or not, through suggestion, imitation, and sympathy, each person shares the ideas, behavior, and emotions of many others, and he himself is a center of influence-radiation in the lives of others. In the life of the individual this is often thought of as the influence of example. Through human history is brought

the example of great men as a heritage of personal influence. The ideals and aspirations, the personal magnetism and outstanding qualities of Washington or Lincoln are spread through the lives of the American people as means of communication establish contacts among them. The swifter the means of communication, the swifter is the spread of the contagion of influence. The more far-reaching the means of communication, the wider is the contagion of influence spread. Fortunate it is if the leaders in a nation's history are leaders of really fine qualities of mind and character, for imitation-suggestion constitutes a medium for the spread of either good or evil influence.

Not only is personal influence thus spread, but national and social ideals are borne in great currents down the stream of history or pass into the lives of other, but contiguous, peoples. In the same way, inventions, whether material or social, are carried throughout the world's life. The automobile supersedes alike the carriage and the jinrikisha. Manhood suffrage, followed by woman suffrage, spreads through not only America and Western Europe, but the Far East and South America. The printing-press and the beginnings of literacy are found together in every quarter of the world. That is to say, culture is diffused from society to society both in space and time.

Suggestion, imitation, and sympathy explain the possibility, therefore, of the great and fundamental social fact of the contagion of influence. To recognize this fact, to utilize it so as to determine the quality of the great social currents of thought and conduct, while guarding against the dangers involved in the very meaning of unreflective suggestion, is one of the prime needs of intelligent civic life. To be well supplied with real knowledge; to know how to think, using that knowledge as a basis; to be able to judge men; and to know what principles should govern the choice of leaders and of representatives: these are some of the important correctives of the dangers of the contagion of influence.

READING REFERENCES

Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, ch. xx.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, ch. xiv.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, chs. xvii and xviii.
Chapin, F. S.: *Social Evolution*, ch. iv.
Pogardus, E. S.: *Essentials of Social Psychology*, ch. vi.
Ross, E. A.: *Social Psychology*, ch. ii.
Kroeber, A. L.: *Anthropology*, ch. viii.

QUESTIONS

1. What is prestige? Upon what does it depend? How does it influence suggestion?
2. In a political campaign do men always vote after careful thinking about the questions at issue? How else is voting determined? What is the meaning of the slang phrase 'climbing on the band wagon'?
3. What is the argument for a censorship of moving-picture films?
4. Which is most under the sway of 'suggestion-imitation': an audience listening to an orator, or scattered individuals reading an article? Why?
5. What is 'propaganda' and what mental process does it depend on?
6. Is good as well as evil spread by imitation? Illustrate.

CHAPTER XI

GROUP LIFE: VARIETIES AND TRAITS

INDIVIDUAL life is always part of group life; the group makes a sort of common life within which the individual lives and acts. Often the group may properly be called, therefore, a community, and indeed it might be wise to use this term in its original sense to describe any group in which there is some degree of common or mutual activity. We might then speak of the family — in so far as it embodies a common life together — as a community. So a school, a church, a trade union, might each be called a community. Perhaps this would tear this term too far from its more accepted meaning, but at least it will help us to realize the great variety of group life, and that the idea of the group is that each embodies something which is common to all its members.

Groups vary in stability. One of the most important differences between groups is their degree of stability. There are groups which seem permanent, such as the English nation, Harvard University, or the family to which each of us belongs. Other groups are evidently temporary and will soon cease to exist, as for example, the crowd at a football game or the people who are gathered on a street corner to watch a fire or a dog-fight. Evidently there may be all degrees of stability or permanency, and these terms are relative rather than absolute, since all groups are subject to conditions which may result in their change or destruction.

Crowd characteristics. The most typical unstable group is that which is spoken of as a crowd. A study of its characteristics and behavior throws much light upon the organization of society and upon some serious civic problems. The fact, too, that it is possible to speak in general terms of 'crowds' or 'the crowd' is significant. It points to the fact that the more stable and permanent groups — such, for example, as may be spoken of as 'communities' — have their separate and distinguishing marks or characteristics. Each one is individual to some extent, the description of its special and

individual features giving at once the peculiar quality and the social function of the group itself. Like the thumb-prints of individual men, no two of which are alike, so stable groups develop community-marks or thumb-prints, the outgrowth both of their special traditions and customary activities, but, even more fundamentally, of their group purposes and the standards which have come to embody these purposes.

But crowds lack these special and essentially individual characteristics in regard to behavior. They act very much alike. How then do crowds behave, and why?

Crowds are peculiarly subject to suggestion, and this is the key to much that enters into the description of their nature. Suggestion refers to the tendency of minds to receive ideas from other minds without questioning them, and to transfer the idea immediately into action. It is an accepted truth of psychology that idea and action are not separate, but that the "tendency of ideas is to be active." If it were not that ideas are inhibited or checked by the existence of other ideas it might be said that every idea would at once become translated into its appropriate activity. Other ideas are, however, commonly present, and this presence sometimes leads to the holding back of action while an idea is examined and then rejected or adopted, as the case may be; or it may be passed on into action quickly, because it is reënforced so to speak, by the previous habits of the individual and the customs of his group. But still there is present in each of us a tendency to act immediately upon the presentation of an idea and this tendency is the basis of much evil action, and is peculiarly characteristic of crowds. Emotional states also are transferred from person to person, and so angers, hatreds, prejudices, ignorant ideas, and falsehoods readily sweep over temporary crowds and carry them into the commission of acts which are destructive and harmful.

It is apparent that when people act upon careful reflection, there is present in the mind not only the act suggested, but some standard of action, some measuring rod with which to compare the proposed activity. These standards are the result of previous behavior and express the ideas established and approved in the more stable groups to which we belong. They are thus a background of ex-

perience, not only of the individual, but of the social life to which he belongs, and they suggest the levels of conduct which social intelligence and consideration of social welfare has reached. But where suggestion dominates, ideas and emotions spread from person to person and are translated into action without comparison or measurement with any established rule or standard of conduct. The ideas which are thus carried are therefore more likely to be instinctive in origin and expressive of impulses on a lower plane than as though reflection intervened. It is to be expected therefore that the *level of conduct of a crowd is low*, and this is found to be the usual case.

Crowds show a *lack of responsibility*. They are usually hastily gathered; there is little feeling of unity; fundamental purpose is often lacking, and emotional excitement is at a high pitch. The hasty character of the crowd prevents its organization and conformity to rule, and stands in the way of the careful choice of leaders or the expression of thoughtful judgment. Therefore, it is not controlled by the thought of the permanent result of its actions. It is changeable in its moods and may turn from acts of savagery to acts of pity in a moment.

Crowds do not develop a high order of leadership. The fact that they are emotional and swayed by passion makes them unresponsive to a calm and reasoning leadership. Rather are they moved by leaders who appeal to passions and hatreds and who are able to carry suggestion through arousing emotions.

It may be concluded, therefore, that crowds are suggestible, unintelligent, unrestrained and emotional, changeable, untrustworthy, easily led but on a low plane. It is necessary, therefore, to inquire if the facts of crowd activities have any significance for modern civic life.

Crowds easily become mobs. Mobs destroy, but they never build. It is necessary to find safeguards therefore against crowd action. In an autocratic government military force usually is relied upon. Is there any other reliance? Critics of democratic government often speak as though the "rule of the people" must mean crowd rule; but this is far from true. Yet it is essential to recognize that there is a constant danger that crowd action may

take the place of orderly rule. In the United States in 1920 there were sixty-four people lynched; that is to say, they were put to death by mob action, and seventy-two attempted lynchings were prevented by officers of the law. This is evidence enough of the danger suggested.

Temporary crowds have their place, but they need to be subject to rules of procedure and standards. An assembly differs from a crowd in that it has its settled rules of order, which tend to organize and control action; speakers must be recognized by a chairman; votes must be taken in regular form and after regular motions. Rules of order thus tend to give a stability to group action and to prevent the sway of passion. To break the actions of a crowd by the division of its work among committees is, again, to delay action, to prevent over-suggestibility, to give intervals for calmness and judgment to express themselves.

In the same way it should be said, every development which leads to self-reliance, thoughtfulness, and intelligence — the work of real education — is a protection against the danger involved in the irresponsibility and weakness of crowds.

Primary and secondary groups. Another important feature of group life is the distinction which Cooley [1] has made current between primary and secondary groups. These two kinds of groups are to be distinguished by the difference in the means of communication which serve as the basis of the life of these groups. Primary groups rely upon simple and direct means of communication, such as oral speech and gesture; while secondary groups are held together by the newer developments of communication — the press, telephone, telegraph, and cable. Early society was therefore — far more than our own — made up of groups and communities of the primary sort. Family and neighborhood were the usual forms of associated life. Religious, political, and recreational gatherings were simply the coming together of the related families of the neighborhood. The village is the usual type of social life, and this social life is expressed in a common oral speech, is based upon common customs and beliefs known and accepted by the village membership. Such direct contact makes possible an intimate group life

[1] *Social Organization*, ch. III.

and develops a remarkable uniformity of approvals, practices and beliefs. Much of this direct relationship remains in our modern world, and its values are extreme. It is in the family and neighborhood that habits are first established in child life; here virtues are developed and ideals are built up. In the play group heroes are first discovered and become contagious examples eagerly followed as models for imitation. How important this habit building is will be realized if it is understood that the virtues which are vital in sustaining societies of every type are in the main the virtues developed in these primary groups. Family obedience is the basis of social discipline and respect for the law; family truthfulness becomes the honesty upon which all business relations rest; fair play in the play group is the kernel of the supreme social virtue — that of justice among men. But not only virtues are thus born; ideals also largely arise in face-to-face group life. The values which are to determine the direction of individual effort, the estimate of what constitutes success and what should be the direction of ambition, at least get their first shaping and suggestion through direct social contacts; approvals, prejudices, sympathies, and antipathies are thus easily developed.

But other contacts to-day are made by newer means of communication, and secondary groups depending upon these newer kinds of contact have qualities somewhat different from primary groups. Emotions are less vigorous, while the ties of such groups are more largely in the nature of knowledge and opinions. Companionship is harder to maintain, and virtues which depend for inspiration upon companionship are less likely to be formed. On the other hand secondary groups grow more readily out of a recognition of new social needs; they represent an enlargement of social contacts, a greater variety of possible interests, better opportunities for the expression of the varying abilities and interests of men, and a greater reliance upon reasoning as compared with the power of custom or the influence of suggestion, for good or ill. The possibilities of building an intelligent public opinion enriched by thoughtful contributions from many sources are greatly strengthened and expanded by secondary types of association.

READING REFERENCES

Bogardus, E. S.: *Essentials of Social Psychology*, chs. VII and VIII.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, chs. III, IV, V.
Hart, J. K.: *Community Organization.*
Lindeman, E. C.: *The Community*, ch. V.
Ross, E. A.: *Social Psychology*, chs. III, IV, V.
Martin, E. D.: *The Behavior of Crowds.*

QUESTIONS

1. Describe some crowd which you have observed. What mental characteristics did it show? What kind of leadership was there? What brought it together? Compare it with an organized assembly, describing the differences observed.
2. Find an account of some crowd described in literature.
3. Is education of any value in preventing crowd action? What kind of education and why? (Read Ross: *Social Psychology*, ch. V.)
4. What social harm may be expected if people grow up having had little experience in primary groups? Why are many cities interested in an effort to revive the neighborhood as a city unit?

CHAPTER XII

HOW GROUPS ARE HELD TOGETHER

THE question naturally arises: How are groups held together? Communities, nations, societies of every sort, have a unitary life. In each there is a consciousness of common membership, of belonging together, of being alike, or of having common interests and aims. The instinctive desire to associate with one's fellows, aided by sympathy, may serve as the beginning. Consciousness of similarities or likenesses, natural or (more largely) acquired, is an important element in the growth of group unity. And equally important is the recognition of those common interests which can be attained only through conscious group organization. But the question still needs to be asked, what means does a group — a society — use to maintain its unity? For it is well to remember that life is carried on always and only by means of organized groups, the maintenance of group life being essential to the continuance of individual life.

'Force' or physical compulsion through punishment. The first answer to the question thus asked is that societies are held together by *force*.[1] That some groups make little use of force will not blind us to the fact that in the major groups, such as the family, the community, industry, and the nation force has always been more or less resorted to.

Whether it is possible to organize societies without the use of force is one of the questions which have occasioned much discussion. Certain it is that some varieties of group life have largely abandoned the use of force, and the progress of the world is closely related to the gradual limitation of force and the reliance upon other methods of insuring group unity. Religious groups do not now rely upon force, but such reliance has been usual in earlier days; the long struggle for religious freedom in the western world was a continuous protest of a part of society against the effort to preserve religious unity by authority and force.

[1] It is to be understood that the term 'force,' as used throughout this chapter refers to physical compulsion based on the threat of punishment.

The family illustrates, also, the use of compulsion, although the decrease in the reliance upon the discipline of force in the family is strikingly apparent in the modern age. Similarly the school is turning its back upon force as the basis of discipline and group organization. In industry, too, slavery, that is to say, enforced labor still exists in some places, though in regard to its use society has in most parts of the world expressed its disapproval. In politics and government the history of two hundred years has seen a progressive modification in the use of force; not that force is less relied upon, but that there has been a change in the control of the use of it. Instead of force being used and controlled by a special and privileged class of society — a monarch or an aristocracy — it has come more and more to be the expression of the will of the entire people. This is a large part of the thought contained in the spread of democracy — not that force will not be used, but that its use will be based upon and controlled by the life and will of the entire society or nation. Yet there is, even in political life, a growing reluctance to rely upon force, even though it represents the entire people: it is so easy for force to become tyranny and so difficult to keep it responsive to the real will of society. For this reason, even in the face of recognized need, there is a strong and growing tendency to discover other means of social unity and control wherever possible. The effort to bring about permanent and peaceful unity between nations is also a recognition of the evil of reliance upon force. At the same time it does not propose to do without force, but rather to accept the fact that peoples the world over now have so much in common that they constitute a *unitary* and single society; and therefore if force is used, it should, in the main, be based upon the will of that entire world-society, and not upon the will of each independent nation. This movement, without doubt, constitutes a great present and future problem and one to which no intelligent citizen can remain indifferent.

Considered as a whole, it seems reasonable to conclude, first, that the organization of society without the use of compulsion is an ideal which the limitations of both intelligence and goodness will render impossible of attainment. Yet the tendency of social organizations may wisely be in the direction of the limitation or even

elimination of force in field after field of human interest and endeavor. Social experience has constantly demonstrated that force leads to repression of the best qualities of those who must submit to it, while freedom develops initiative and leads to creative energy. Wherever it is possible to rely upon organized good-will, there the results have been socially more satisfactory than where force has been the basis of organization. The real problem seems to be to find means of organizing the intelligence and energy of social groups in such a way that their good-will is also organized and called out. The result is thereby to recognize and to enlarge the attainment of freedom without giving up effective organization.[1]

Moreover, in the second place, it is clear that it is impossible for society to reach its two main purposes — the attainment of justice and freedom — unless the use of force be restricted to one authority only. Within the nation our most serious conflicts arise through the use of force by more than one group or individual. Two or more groups, each privileged or sanctioned to use force, inevitably move toward violence and the destruction of social organization instead of its upbuilding; at the same time freedom disappears and injustice through exploitation rules. It is for this reason that society has come to lodge the final use of force in the State, as expressed in government, and to withdraw it more and more from other kinds of groups. The use of force by the family is now subject to governmental restriction and oversight; the use of force in industry as expressed in slavery has disappeared and legislation limits it in factory, mine, and store, granting at least partial protection to industrial life. The State is now the chief coercive, that is, force-using, institution or type of social organization, and its most difficult problem is to restrain its own use of force where possible, on the one hand, and to use it, on the other hand, not at the demand of some special part, but only in the interests of the whole or entire social life.[2]

Custom as the basis of social unity. What other means has society of obtaining social unity? Even the most tyrannical nations and ages have not relied upon force alone. Custom is a bond be-

[1] See Russell: *Proposed Roads to Freedom.*

[2] For further consideration of this problem, see Chapter XXVI.

tween men the power of which cannot be estimated. Silent, pervasive, omnipresent, it finds its way into the lives of men from earliest childhood, moulding their habits alike, shaping their ideals about common models, directing their thinking into common channels, embedding in them common approvals, standards, and tastes; and thereby subjecting them to a common discipline. This constitutes the common heritage of a society — not to be confused with individual or racial heredity, which is biological and a phase of the inborn nature.

Custom is a far bigger fact than is indicated by the usual description of isolated usages. It is the great underlying basis of communal life. Every generation receives from its predecessors an intricate organized *system* of living, including knowledge, beliefs, sentiments and types of conduct, in regard to every important field of human interest. At a given moment no one can realize or describe how much of his life is simply an expression of this vast basic body of customs, this interwoven social heritage. Methods of communication which make possible communal life, such as language, are in large part customary. Methods of making a living and of creating wealth rest upon traditional ideas and customary action. The organization and relationships of the family, of religion, of politics, and of education are in large part the product of past life and are embodiments of custom and tradition. And the very modes of thinking and acting through which change and even advancement takes place — invention, migration, discussion, warfare — are themselves more or less traditional and a product of the past. It is no more possible for an individual or a community or a nation to shake loose from custom than from life itself, although there is more or less of change going on continually.

The term 'custom' is here used to mean both group ways of acting (behavior) and of thinking and feeling. The latter aspects are often expressed by the term tradition, but the interaction of action and ideas is so close that it seems unwise, except for special emphasis, to try to separate those aspects of what may be called the folkways or social heritage.

Therefore, in asking the question, how are groups held together, it is apparent that unity is primarily the outgrowth of the fact of a

common system of life expressed in folkways or custom. To study the history of a nation is primarily to try to unravel the many strands of its present "web of life" so as to understand at what time, under what circumstances and for what reasons they entered and became elements or factors in that common life; it is to endeavor to describe that social life and to explain, in some degree, its origin and its effectiveness as a basis of living. Evidently custom is itself modified and is subject to a gradual evolution. The study of social evolution is, on its descriptive side, the study of the evolution of what has been called the communal life as expressed in custom. No one can go far in understanding the social and civic problems of our time until he has come to realize to some extent the power and meaning of custom.

The power of the social heritage. In describing primary group life our attention is fixed upon that variety of organized society which was developed in the earliest ages and which was made possible by such means of contact between minds as early life had devised. The family, the neighborhood, the village, developed early, because the conditions of knowledge made possible a simple life only, supporting only small numbers. These groups had their underlying bodies of custom, growing out of their needs and their degree and kinds of knowledge; and making for them a system of life — a culture — much of which is carried on to a later age, even though it is no longer valuable. Such social life varied in many aspects; one group differed from another (in spite of certain fundamental similarities), by the fact of difference in geographical background, in possible types of inventiveness, in what may be called the accidents or special incidents of the life and history of each. It was possible, therefore, for quite divergent varieties of custom or folkways to develop; and tribes and peoples became quite distinct one from another. Dialects and languages varied, costume was provincial or national, tools and methods of work were to some extent peculiar to each group, and so also were ways of meeting important moments or crises in group life, such as birth, marriage, death, famine, war. In these and other aspects of life, early peoples developed their different and distinct systems of living and thinking — their cultures; yet it was at least often (perhaps always) true that

their inborn natures — their hereditary qualities — were essentially alike. It is well to try to realize this fundamental fact, that differences between peoples have been gradually acquired through the growth of their varying systems of living, and that these quite different systems do not necessarily indicate any great or important difference in natural inheritance; they are the expression of the differences in 'social inheritance' or customs which resulted largely from varying circumstances and conditions of living, and from lack of contacts between groups.

Contact of cultures lessens social differences. To spread knowledge, and to break up group isolation through new contacts between groups, both leading to invention, is the way by which divergences of custom have been broken down. This is the outgrowth, as has been already shown, of the development of means of communication. To-day the world, it is said, is at the 'cross-roads'; that is, all groups are in contact one with another, and the result is that there is a mingling and competition of custom or social heritage. Changes in the Oriental world are the immediate result of contact with the 'culture' or system of living of the West: not only are the Chinese losing their queues, they are beginning also to change their ways of work, their family worship and organization, and may in time modify their language. Culture-contact, — that is, the meeting of two distinct systems of living as expressed through custom — has always been one of the most important causes of the change in the life of people.

Origin of likeness and difference in social heritages. Customs usually originate in human needs, and all important needs are expressed, not by individual action in the main, but by group or communal action. It is to be expected therefore, that while there arise in time great divergences between the customs of one people as compared with another, yet there will be certain fundamental likenesses also. Thus it is possible to observe great stages or eras in the fundamental customs of different peoples, in which while there are great diversities in detail, the more fundamental aspects are alike. This will appear later, as we study certain fundamental typical institutions of society.

In addition to a basis in human needs, customs originate also

from invention and discovery. This is the element in the folkways which may in part illustrate a possible difference between peoples or groups in their inborn nature. Invention is in some degree accidental undoubtedly; it is in part, also, due to the special pressure of need, the varying emphasis which the social life feels and expresses to its members: "necessity is the mother of invention" is an ancient proverb which expresses an important aspect of the origin of invention. But invention is also, without question, due at times to superior inborn nature, and it may be true that some branches of the human race — some distinct peoples — may have within their biological heredity a greater tendency to produce great natural ability, though here we are as yet upon debatable ground.

And customs grow also from special or peculiar conditions in natural environment, and from special incidents, contacts, struggles, experiences which each group has passed through. For illustration, it is quite evident that a part of the customary life of the Eskimos is due to natural environment; while the political customs of the people of the United States are in part the outgrowth of a rich natural environment and in part the consequence of colonial ideas which belonged to the expanding British Empire in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ideas found in English law and English religious struggle as expressed in English speech. The Constitution of the United States originated in English political customs, which differ from the political folkways of other peoples chiefly through differences in the incidents of their past history. The life of the American Nation is determined in part by the character of its constitution, which is its fundamental law, and by its English speech and body of traditions. Yet, on the other hand, the coming to America of large numbers from many parts of the world other than Great Britain has meant the bringing of other than English customs and ways. Consequently there has taken place a mingling of customs, so that American life is not English but American. Our own history, too, has had its special incidents and struggles out of which customs and ways peculiarly American have come to exist and to characterize our life.

Thus it is apparent that custom, though itself a result of past association, is a great unifying force in social life. "It is evidently

necessary that a people who compose a community and participate in common enterprises shall have a body of common memories." [1] The fact of common traditions or folkways leads people to realize that they have something in common, that they are alike; though also it may lead them to emphasize and even exaggerate the apparent differences between themselves and other peoples. All groups have thus tended to feel that their customs have permanent value: recognizing the need to live and work together, the fact that custom builds a common or communal life leads naturally to a regard for custom and an unwillingness to see any change.

Social menace of the power of custom. The value is thus evident; but it is wise to recognize that there is a corresponding danger. The regard for custom tends to make it unchangeable. It may have originated in need, though often greed or hatred may also have had to do with its beginnings; but as conditions of life are subject to change, customs tend to be less and less suited to the real needs of society; and as knowledge and reflection often lead to a recognition of the original and continued injustice of the folkways, the need for reorganization is evident. Yet they remain unchanged, constituting at times what has been called a 'cake of custom,' an unbreakable burden which prevents all progress. Social conflicts are constantly arising, therefore, over the suitability or value of customs and traditions. The conservative is the man who either by nature, by education, or by the advantage of social position, approves the customary system of life. The radical, for opposite reasons, demands its abolition. Conflicts in every field of life are in considerable part the natural consequence of such differences in regard to custom, and the fact that customs are rather in part an expression of past adjustments to life than of present ones.

Mores or standards. When it is said that groups are held together by custom, it is necessary to notice that customs in certain fields of life are of far more consequence than in others. The building up of relations between members of the group, whatever it may be, is an effort to establish a workable system of life, and those relationships which are valued most highly stand out in tradition as having a special imprint of public approval. These relations may

[1] Park and Miller: *Old World Traits Transplanted*, p. 270.

not in any absolute sense, be right, yet they have at least the suggestion in them that they are so. The Ten Commandments of the Hebrew people are an expression of those customary relations which seemed to them of extreme importance. They are called laws, which suggests merely that they are a part of the social heritage that is considered most vital to the life of that society. It is to be noticed too that these customs have to do with those activities which a people considers most worth while, and therefore with what ought to be the *conduct* of members of their community. These highly important parts of the customs or folkways are spoken of as the *mores*, that is the moral customs, the conduct customs which are most highly valued. Ross [1] wisely suggests and uses rather the term 'standards,' and this is the term which is used in this discussion. Those approvals of a society, therefore, which are customary and which have to do with the conduct of men in relation to each other, constitute the standards of the community. In holding together group life these standards are the most fundamental part of its customs or folkways. About them there grows a mass of emotion or feeling which is itself the expression of social approval and which is hard to modify.

It is possible, therefore, to see that what we call laws and morals are a part of custom — that which society considers its most valued heritage because these standards are at the basis of the possibility of the very existence of group life. This is simply to say that moral or right conduct is essential to group or social life, and that the ideals of such conduct are in the main suggested to each generation as a body of custom or tradition. Socially considered, morals are the accepted social judgments and ways of action in regard to relations among men, approved and overlaid with feeling, by which group life is made possible.[2]

Historical values of great peoples. The importance of the social heritage is made clear when one observes how such a heritage or system of tradition has sometimes been passed from one people to another. For this reason historians have described for us the special or distinguishing elements contributed to the stream of history by

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, ch. XLVII.

[2] The development of moral institutions is discussed later in Part III

the body of traditions which are characteristic of different ones of the great historic peoples. They point to the vigorous religious and moral nature of the Hebrew people. Through them there came into the life of the Western World the conception of the unity of worship in one God; the idea that God is as a father and moved by the principle of love for all mankind who are his children; and the related idea of the brotherhood of man. Building upon Hebrew tradition, Jesus became the founder of Christianity, emphasizing the supreme worth of personality regardless of class or rank or race; teaching that the basis of both individual and social life is love, not hatred nor hostility; and that the value of every life, of every institution, of every society is measured by the principle of service.

In the course of time these ideas became expanded into a system of ideals, of thinking, of ceremonies, of organization, constituting the religion of Christianity and the organization of the Christian Church. This is a fundamental heritage, carried from generation to generation as an interwoven system of tradition, fundamentally affecting and forming the life of our own age.

In the same way the tradition system of the Greek people has been carried over into the life of the Western World. Artistic, inventive, original, observers of nature and of social life, they became creators in the world of beauty. Poetry, sculpture, and architecture developed under their imaginative control, and forever after their time the world's content of beauty in material construction, in the human form, and in the art of rhythmic expression of thought has been enriched. They became the first great scientific people; regard for truth as well as an interest in nature, led to investigation and measurement, resulting in a real basis of scientific observation in many fields of life. Discussion and the organization of careful thinking became a passion and through their activities truth came to have a regard which went far toward freeing it from superstition and ignorance. These ideas were a part of the inner life of the Greek people, and when they were absorbed into the Roman Empire their ideas and system of life went with them, thus combining itself with the special Hebrew tradition to constitute a further element in the social custom or heritage passed on to later generations.

Once more, it is pointed out that the Roman people had also their

peculiar traditional life. Of special importance was their organizing ability as seen in law and in military activity. For good or ill Roman law, Roman methods of government, and Roman military organization have become parts of the customary life and thought of later times. Supreme order, maintained by military force and obedience to law, has become the traditional thought of government and of the ambition of statesmen, since the Roman age. The skill of the Roman rule in holding together vastly distant as well as different peoples, through means of transportation — the great Roman roads — through wide-spreading trade, and through enforced peace, has become so completely a part of modern thought and practice that, as is always the case with custom, it is difficult to disentangle the good from the evil in it.

These are sufficient illustrations to emphasize the underlying power of custom. At no time has a people ever broken away entirely from it; only on one or more sides of life at a time, political, religious, educational, has it been possible to make so great a change, and to do so even in a single field has usually taken what is called a revolution.

READING REFERENCES

Bagehot, W.: *Physics and Politics.*
Blackmar, F. W.; and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XXV and XXVI.
Chapin, F. S.: *Social Evolution*, ch. VI.
Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology* (second edition), ch. III.
Giddings, F. H.: *Elements of Sociology*, ch. XIV, and pp. 242 to 253.
Hobhouse, L. T.: *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, pp. 35–38.
Kelsey, C.: *The Physical Basis of Society*, ch. X.
Ross, E. A.: *Social Psychology*, chs. XII to XV.
Sumner, W. G.: *Folkways*, ch. I.
Ellwood, C. A.: *The Social Problem*, ch. II.

QUESTIONS

1. Explain the meaning of the following lines from Emerson:

> "I am owner of the sphere,
> Of the seven stars and the solar year,
> Of Cæsar's hand and Plato's brain,
> Of Lord Christ's heart and Shakespeare's strain."

2. What is the social value of tradition? In what fields of life and in relation to what great human interests is it developed?

3. Are traditions always reasonable or just? Why is there likely to be conflict between traditions and the growth of scientific knowledge?
4. What was the chief value to later society which came from the ancient Greek civilization? From the Hebrew civilization? From the Roman?
5. What evils have been handed on from the civilization or culture of any of these peoples?
6. The conservative has been described as one who holds fast all the traditions; the radical as one who throws all traditions away. What do you think about the wisdom of each of these attitudes?
7. What moral standards are found in the family? in the play group?
8. If a family or play group has no moral standards is it a good or wholesome society? What effect upon members of the group?
9. Is it necessary that such standards be continually reëxamined if they are to be vigorous or useful? Why?

CHAPTER XIII

CHANGE AND WHY IT COMES

CUSTOM and tradition suggest and rest upon the fact of fixity or continuity: a tendency for what *is* to remain. But opposed to it is the equally universal principle of change: a tendency toward *alteration*. In nature this is called variation and is recognized as a universal tendency. In society this fact of change is as universal as in nature, and the problems of social organization are fundamentally affected and directed by it.

Changes are both planned and unplanned. Why they occur. Why and how does society change its life? In answering these questions it is necessary to distinguish those changes which are often both unobserved and unplanned, from those which express the conscious ideas and definite aims of society. Considering changes of a fundamental sort, observation is directed first to the underlying forces in nature, to the modification of nature by man, to the chance or incidental events appearing in the life of societies, and to new knowledge resting on invention. Occasionally an important modification of climate or other feature of physical geography has driven whole societies to change their mode of living; this is a rare example and need not be considered as a great cause of change except in ancient times. But modification of geography by man in his use of nature and natural resources is continually leading to changes in social organization. The building of roads, canals, or harbors constitutes a redirection of commerce and travel, and often has been the unexpected basis for the downfall of cities and the redistribution of population into new centers. Discovery of hitherto unknown resources, as coal, iron, or gold; or the using up or destruction of known resources such as forests, wild animal food, or minerals, have led to migration or the invention of new ways of production and the gradual alteration of standards of liv-

[1] This chapter was written before Ogburn's *Social Change* appeared. This keen and stimulating book will richly repay reading by students, both young and old.

ing, a possible change in the size of the population, and perhaps new industrial and political arrangements, though these social changes were in no sense foreseen while the changes in geography were taking place. Undoubtedly the growth in the size of a population, intensifying the pressure upon resources and the struggle for existence, is a powerful fundamental factor in the continual process of change; and on the opposite side, the decrease of a population has frequently — as in sections of American rural life to-day — led to the gradual disappearance or decay of institutions or forms of social organization.

Migration and war. Two other conditions which have been more or less constant among many peoples and in many conditions of society are migration and war. Early migration by whole peoples in continuous process of adjustment to nature's food supply and to changing seasons and climates has given place in modern times to individual and family migration, to trade movements, to the development of great markets and to change therefore in the size and location of cities, to the minute division of labor and the growth of minute specialization in industry. War, because it necessitated coercion in order to bring about efficient organization for either offensive or defensive operations, led often to a complete rearrangement of political life. A military organization of society has tended to push aside a peaceful (for example, family) system of social control and the military power has come to rule, becoming the basis of classes, of social distinction and of a monopoly of property. Both migration and war have led, as has also trade and travel, to what is called the contact of cultures, which is itself one of the most fundamental factors in changing social life. The continual contact of one body of custom with another is suggestive of far-reaching change. Two differing cultures do not fit together, at least without fundamental changes; and the very contrast between them leads to reflection and to suggestion of new arrangements. Such coming together of different customs or cultures may be studied to-day in the meeting of Oriental life and that of Western civilization. The transformation of Japan; the growing unrest in China and India, in Egypt and Persia, indicates the contact of one system of life with another. For the moment the Oriental culture is changing most

rapidly, but it may be possible at a later time to observe more or less of change in some respects among Western peoples. To study throughout the length of recorded history the places and ages in which different cultures have met is extremely suggestive because it shows how tremendous is the influence upon social life of such social contacts.

Invention. One further important cause of change must be considered. This is the fact of invention and discovery, and is of both individual and social origin. Invention originates in the mind of an individual, but the possibility of such new ideas is dependent not only upon the existence of a gifted mind — a genius — but upon the knowledge, the social organization and direction of interest of the time and people as a basis and condition. An Edison could make many inventions in the present age, by using the mathematical and scientific knowledge of to-day, which he could not have dreamed of had he shared only the culture and traditions of a primitive people. Discovery and invention is cumulative, therefore. It expresses the vision and power of individual minds, but each gifted mind builds on the foundation of the discoveries which come to it in the social heritage or traditional culture. Thus the possibilities of change through invention and discovery are an expression, in part, of the same fact which is found in the contact of cultures. The meeting of contrasting and so competing cultures takes place at a given time and place, and constitutes a single though protracted event or epoch of intermingling ideas and of changed life: the meeting of Roman and Germanic cultures, or of Greek and Persian, for example. But the invention of an individual represents a mental contact also; it is the contact of the individual mind with the stream of ideas which have been interwoven into the system or web of life which has been transmitted out of the past to his own age. History records the accumulated discoveries of many ages and these become moulded into the system of knowledge which each individual at a given moment is able to build upon in making new inventions in any field of life. And because such an accumulated stream of knowledge may be shared by an individual who has grown up under a different culture it becomes possible, for example, for a young Japanese to be an inventor in the field of

modern electricity, though the basal knowledge is Western and not Oriental. Thus in explaining the constant changes in the world which grow out of knowledge it is necessary to recognize the extreme social importance of having and of stimulating great minds within a people; but it is also to be remembered that the impulse to invent is not enough to produce the invention; there is also the accumulated interwoven system of knowledge and thought which such a mind must use. Knowledge is not simply a succession of unrelated ideas; it is a great complex construction out of long continued increments of invention, and through it the individual mind is in contact with a long stream of other great minds, inventing and discovering through the ages. Contact of cultures is thus the contact of systems of life and thought at a given time: while invention and discovery is in part at least contact of each mind with the life and thought of preceding times as brought down in the stream of systematized tradition.

Fields of invention. Inventions may lead to change in many fields of life. They may be in the knowledge and use of nature — her resources or her forces; such inventions are primarily material and mechanical, leading to changed methods of production of wealth and to changes in the methods and means of transportation and communication between people. Discovery in nature has also led to the changes in ideas and arrangements in regard to the preservation of life through the control of disease.

Invention is also active in the field of human relations; the introduction of popular voting, of the idea of universal education, or of a regular procedure of constitutional amendment, are inventions as much as the invention of the steam engine or the electric motor, and are of supreme importance in changing the life of mankind.

It is perhaps necessary to remind ourselves that fashions are not important causes of real change. While fashion is itself a constant adoption of the new, nevertheless it takes more than the shift in fashion to go far in the way of real or important change. For fashion is limited in its changes by the 'larger usual,' that is by custom and convention. Its sway is ordinarily within rather narrow limits except when (or in fields where) there is no definite custom or the custom has been entirely broken. For example, clothes change

with fashion, but for women to abandon skirts for trousers is so great a breach of custom that, if it should come, it will be only after long demonstration of real merit in the change, not merely as fashion. If in time such a change should come to pass, there will then be variations in trousers as a matter of fashion. In other words, fashion is not interested in permanent values, but is simply the sweep of suggestion plus a liking for the new and a desire for distinction. It is not, therefore, an important source of real or significant change.

Summary of causes of social change. This brief outline of various important causes of change points to three main types of condition which tend to modify society. They are changes in physical environment, changes in the population basis of society, and (of much the greatest significance) changes which result from mental contacts and origination. Or, to state the problem differently: those changes are of greatest social consequence which alter either (1) the size or distribution of population; or (2) the distribution of wealth; or (3) which make new contacts among men; or (4) which add to the sum of knowledge. Such changes carry within them the possibility of new or redirected desires and thus new social ideals, and in the end a modified social heritage or social order.

Eras of change. Now it is evidently true that these changes may be more rapid in one period than another, and also that they are not independent of each other. Our own age is peculiarly an age of rapid and enormous change. It has been said that there were more important modifications of the life of mankind in the nineteenth century than in the preceding thousand years. A great part of these changes have had to do with the natural environment. It is well for students to try to list such changes in order to appreciate their extent. The wide use of machinery in the making and carrying of goods is of course of recent date. The building of roads and railroads, bridges, great canals and harbors, steamships, printing-presses, and enormous buildings has changed the appearance of nature and has brought about a new grouping of people. The isolation of separate groups or societies, each having its peculiar life and customs, has given place to a mingling of social elements and to a wide and complex contact of varying traditions and folkways.

Thus Western science, as applied to production and the control of disease, has met Eastern mysticism and has encountered alien religious and family ways. Japanese art, a product of generations of tradition, has faced a rather artistically barren American appreciation and contrasting European art development; while musical development in Hungary or Poland has found a way across the political and national boundaries of Europe. This constant intermingling of diverse cultures, in part alike but often quite unlike, has been, without doubt, a fruitful stimulus to thinking and to critical judgment. And, also, the vastly complex modifications of life have often resulted from the factor of discovery, the bringing to light of the new and its spread through imitation or the recognition of its real social value.

Historically, the eras of great change in the world's life are most striking in their interest. They arrest attention because of their dramatic power and because they suggest so plainly the conflict among the great forces which rule the formation and the movements of society, and because it is at such times that societies reveal the universal tendency either to make great advance through wise adjustment to the new conditions or to fall into stagnation and possible extinction. To illustrate: the spread of the Empire of Alexander the Great is far more than a biographical story of the adventurous activities of an individual. It is a movement through which there is brought to pass a wide spreading of new life through a varied and long-continued contact of cultures. The intellectual development of the Greek world met the religious emotional life of the East, and each influenced the other. The freer individual life of the Greek encountered the massed imperialism of the East; adopting its forms to some extent, but invigorating it with its own energy.

To pass to later epochs, the Crusades are again a suggestive illustration of culture-contact, a meeting of the ruder and less educated, but more vigorous and aggressive Western life with the richer, more intellectual, but weaker and often decadent Eastern civilizations. The European Renaissance suggests the effort of Europe to adjust its authoritative tradition to the emergence of new ideas and discoveries sometimes brought to light through culture-contacts,

but in part the direct result of the inventive spirit. To trace to its roots this great movement — intellectual in Southern Europe and religious and moral in Northern Europe — is a fascinating as well as profitable study in the nature, the causes, and the results of change in society. The French Revolution gives us another interesting era of change, this time preëminently political, with the emergence of new ideas, the conflict with the traditional life of the past, the problem of adjustment and the building of a modified order out of the old. And finally it must again be emphasized, that our own age is so thoroughly an era of change that it is extraordinarily difficult to understand and to appraise the recent great world movements in intellectual, economic, political, religious, and moral life. How feeble is the grasp upon the movements of our world of the man who thinks of the Great War as a plot of an ambitious ruler with a coterie of followers. Evidently it is the critical climax in the meeting of conflicting ideas and forces, growing out of vast and long-continuing changes. If it is not to be the beginning of the downward course of the civilization of the Western World, it will be because of the growth of a better understanding of the great underlying changes of our age; an appreciation of the tremendous need of thorough readjustment to these changes, politically, industrially, and morally; and a vitalized social conscience that shall lead men and societies to a higher and more socialized standard of conduct.

READING REFERENCES

Ellwood, C. A.: *Sociology in its Psychological Applications*, pp. 163–72.
Ogburn, W. F.: *Social Change*. Especially Parts I and II.
Robinson, J. H.: *Mind in the Making*.
Ross, E. A.: *Sociological Foundations*, chs. x and xi.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. xxxvi and xxxvii.

QUESTIONS

1. Enumerate what you consider the greatest inventions in industry from early times to the present. In the control of disease. In social relations.
2. Is an international congress or court an invention? Is a statesman ever an inventor? Was the Constitution of the United States an invention? Is a corporation an invention? An employee-representative committee system in industry?

3. Explain the meaning of the statement, 'Inventions are cumulative.'
4. Explain the fact that many inventions have been made by more than one inventor at about the same time.
5. How does new contact bring change? What is the meaning of the expression 'contact of cultures'?
6. Outline a few of the great changes in our own age. (Read Ross: *Outlines of Sociology*, p. 364.)

CHAPTER XIV

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES SUGGESTED BY THE FACTS OF CUSTOM AND CHANGE

CERTAIN conclusions may be drawn from a survey of the problems thus outlined. Change in the social life is quite largely unobserved and uncontrolled by the knowledge and planning of society. The traditional order is a great though unconscious director of the activities of men through guiding their desires and controlling the opportunities for their expression. Social changes have to do with the redirecting of human behavior through changing desires and the opportunities for their expression.

Change is necessary for social welfare. Why, then, does the custom basis of life need change? The first answer is that customs constantly fail to fit the needs of a changing society. Changes in population, in natural environment, in the means of association, render old arrangements of society obsolete and unworkable. As such changes are going on all the time it is in the nature of things that older social arrangements, even though at one time admirable, must gradually cease to be useful. Ordinarily the older the custom the more likely it is to be unsuited to social need.

A second answer to the question is that a large part of the social order expressed in custom was never designed to meet the real needs of the life of the entire society which uses it. Far too often social custom was in its origin a body of arrangements made in the interests of a ruling group and serving its needs only. What is called privilege is usually either an expression of such customs or of those which may have had originally a wider usefulness but have come now to react to the advantage of only a part of society. The beginnings of opportunity for other, non-privileged groups, brings from them the demand for change. The emergence of a 'commercial' class before the French Revolution illustrates this situation in its demand for a share in political power.

Once more, the coming of new knowledge often shows old ways to be foolish. Ignorance of nature or of human nature is the basis

of many a tradition, such as the belief that evil spirits cause sickness. New knowledge and its extension through education points the weakness and folly of such traditional usages and ideas and leads to a demand for their abolition. Under such circumstances there comes to pass a critical attitude, a questioning of the wisdom of social arrangements, a demand that they be tested by the application of intelligence.

Resistance to change. This attitude of mind is the basis of wise readjustment or rebuilding, but it meets serious resistance. The conservatively minded dislike all change, worshiping the old and not perceiving that change of some sort is inevitable.[1] The groups in society which are well placed fear that change will undermine their special privilege or social ascendancy; they thus become more interested in their special group advantage than in the larger social welfare; while the ignorant and unthinking suggestible mass is swayed by emotional prejudices, stock words and phrases, and crowd excitements. Moreover, even to the wisest, the observation of social life is difficult. Conditions are easily misunderstood and the complexity of life itself makes experiment and careful trial of great uncertainty.

It is not so easy to perceive when an idea, standard, or policy is out of date and deserves to be scrapped as it is to perceive when a machine or technique is out of date and ought to be scrapped. Consequently the great majority of men are holding to ideas, standards and policies which they learned from their parents or adopted in their youth, but which are unsuited to the changed situation.[2]

Hence it is that the movements for adjusting social relations to meet the underlying changes in any age are hindered, delayed or turned aside. The result is the growth of hostilities and discontent, with possibilities of war or revolution. A large part of that education in citizenship so much demanded and needed is an education which will enable men and women to observe and measure clearly the character and efficiency of their social life in terms of

[1] As examples it is sufficient to remember the opposition to the extension of the suffrage to the laboring classes, and later to women; opposition to limitations proposed to the inheritance of property; and opposition to freedom in religious belief.

[2] Ross, E. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, p. 541. The Century Co.

welfare. This is true of political relations, of industrial relations, of moral, religious, and intellectual relations.

Since, therefore, the conditions of life are in constant movement, it is but the part of wisdom for societies to recognize the need of continual and careful modification of social relations and arrangements which express their life. And it is essential also to understand that there are certain principles important to keep in mind which govern such changes.

Social direction of change. Principles to be observed. Changes in social life may be either planned or unplanned. Planned changes recognize the possibilities of social modification and progress, while unplanned changes take place without recognition of the social meaning of what is happening. For example, the influx of immigrants has probably been responsible for a competition in New England between the older American stock and the newer immigrant groups, in standards of living, which has been a factor in the reduction of the birth rate of the older stock almost to the point of its extinction. This change in racial stock in the population is unplanned, yet of great consequence to the American people. For a society to plan its changes, to survey its needs and to study the possibilities of meeting them, difficult as it is, is but doing for societies what thoughtful men do for their individual lives. Eventually, planned or *telic* change (the term used by Ward) should very largely supersede chance or *genetic* change. Nevertheless, in the development of society to the present day undoubtedly unplanned changes far exceed planned changes.

In the second place, societies need to organize definite methods of bringing about social changes. Regular methods of amendment, not only of laws and constitutions, but of customs and standards, are fundamentally necessary. This is a part of that larger problem, the question of whether change shall be regular and smooth in its working or irregular and violent. Society's greatest danger lies in opposing all change and so obstructing the movement of social adjustment altogether. Such obstruction inevitably piles up grievances and hostility until they overflow all barriers, becoming a revolution of violence. History is full of illustrations of this simple but fundamental principle. The causes of the violence of the

French Revolution were the unyielding hostility to all change manifested by the privileged classes of society — king, nobles, and church — in the face of great suffering and social need. It is quite probable that all the horrors of the Reign of Terror might have been avoided had there been a willingness to make important and needed changes step by step. Equally true is it that the violence of the present Russian Soviet government is a more or less inevitable result of long years of oppression and steady refusal to modify or change unworthy social arrangements in the face of great social need for such change. Revolutions do not occur by chance. Social events are the product of definite social causes, and history is too full of examples to make it possible to deny the statement that societies which refuse to make regular and continuous social readjustments or changes must pay the penalty of violence and destruction.

It is wise, therefore, in the third place, for a society to adopt in reference to change, the principles of toleration of difference and of compromise in regard to conflicting interests and ideas. Society is a complex mass of individuals, groups, interests, plans, customs, laws, and ambitions. While a degree of unity is essential to its existence, yet wide differences may wisely be accepted. If there is freedom of discussion, usually much of the difference tends to disappear, and in any case there are few times and conditions in which complete agreement in ideas and likeness in action are essential. Toleration of varying ideas, resting on freedom of discussion, makes change likely to be regular and orderly instead of violent. In this way compromise becomes a recognized principle of social action. Peoples who are intolerant and have never learned how to compromise with each other in the reorganizing of social plans and arrangements are likely to be specially subject to the violence of constant revolutions.

Finally, it should be held as a principle governing the criticism of all social life and so the making of change, that every custom, every institution, every group, and every member of society must perform a social function. That is to say, the worth of each is measured by its relation to social welfare. If an institution has had a social function, but no longer performs it, it needs to be changed; to function socially is to do something of value for society, and the

test is universal and inexorable. The recognition of this principle by an individual or a group constitutes in them a consciousness of social obligation. Equally must a custom, a tradition, an institution accept this test.

It is necessary now to return to the question with which we started in Chapter XII — How are societies held together? Sometimes, and in some degree at all times, by force, was the first answer. More thorough and more effective, however, is the welding and uniting power of custom. And of greatest uniting strength are traditional ways of thinking and of conduct which have to do with most important relationships between men and which therefore are considered as right, that is, as morally binding. We paused then to consider the break of custom through the tendency to change.

Other possible factors in social unity. It is natural to ask, are there not many other elements of union through which groups are bound and held together? Is not religion a great welder of groups, making strong and powerful units out of diverse sorts of men? Is not the engaging in a common industrial enterprise or type of life also a basis and condition of group unity? Is it not true that these are but illustrations of the fact of the great variety of such forces which bind men into groups and hold them there?

In reply it is enough for our purpose to say that religion becomes a great body of tradition and so is usually a vital part of the customary order, the social heritage which builds a common life. Similarly a common industrial life is a great uniting factor in society primarily because it becomes a part of the order, the body of traditional ideas and arrangements, the settled and customary lines of thought, action, and relationships in respect to industry which direct the habits of thought and behavior of the individual members of society. In some ages and among some peoples the body of religious traditions is the most important basis of permanent unity. Under other conditions other elements of tradition assume the greatest importance in this respect. Perhaps it was commercial traditions and usages that constituted the greatest binding power among such a seafaring and adventurous people as the Phœnicians; or possibly common appreciations of types of the beautiful in art may be considered as of an importance at least greater than usual,

among the ancient Greeks. Custom is all-inclusive; it invades every field of life; it is a mass-tendency to organize life socially, by groups, and to carry over from generation to generation, from age to age, this established and inherited social life. To speak of custom is to describe the order of society, which is indeed subject to change, but which at any moment is the mass background of that which is established and arranged and through which groups live and continue. It is this which prevents groups (communities or nations) from going to pieces when social arrangements are evil. Rarely, perhaps never, does revolution or change take place in every field of custom. In one age it is religious custom which is criticized and changed, in another political custom, and in still another the emphasis and dissatisfaction is in the field of the economic order.

READING REFERENCES

Ellwood, C. A.: *Introduction to Social Psychology*, chs. VI, VII, VIII.
Ellwood, C. A.: *The Social Problem*, ch. II.
Goldenweiser, A. A.: *Early Civilization*, ch. XIV.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, chs. XI, XII.
Kroeber, A. L.: *Anthropology*, chs. X, XI.
Ogburn, W. F.: *Social Change.*
McCabe, J.: *The Evolution of Civilization*, chs. V, VI, VII.
Burns, C. D.: *Principles of Revolution*, chs. VI, VII, VIII.

QUESTIONS

1. How does custom limit movements for social betterment, and how is this limitation overcome? Give illustrations.
2. Why do people fear social change? Find illustrations in American history.
3. Is revolution a social movement which can be traced to definite social causes? Summarize the possible changes which were demanded before the French Revolution came to a head. Why were they not granted?
4. What part of American social heritage has come to us from Great Britain? Have other European peoples contributed to our social heritage?
5. How has 'culture-contact' changed the life of the Japanese in modern times? What changes are arising in China from the same cause?
6. If inventions are cumulative — that is, build one upon another — is there advantage to a people in being situated so as to share in past inventions from many sources? Compare in this respect the Eskimos with the French or English; or Europe in 1910 with Europe in 800.
7. Explain the statement, "The development of communication is equalizing the inventive capacities of different peoples."

CHAPTER XV

CONFLICT

If one were able to look down upon society as from an airplane he would see two very different and opposing types of activity. Perhaps it would be more accurate to describe them as opposing tendencies which work out in manifold opposing activities. On the one hand, he would see bodies of people working together: Here is a factory with a thousand workmen engaged in turning out a single product. There is a farmer with his family, all united in the cultivation of a crop of wheat, or a harvest crew is engaged in threshing the wheat. Everywhere men are working together in the bringing about of results which seem desired. This tendency to work and act together, to unite many activities into one is coöperation, and it is the essence of organization.

On the other hand, looking down upon the same society the observer would see also men struggling against each other: Perhaps it is an athletic contest and two teams are engaged in a tug of war; or it is a race and individuals are running, each striving to pass the others. Possibly it is more serious, and armies are engaged in the determined effort each to destroy the other. The factory, which seemed to be a place of coöperation, may after all contain within itself the struggle of one part against another, each trying to overthrow the other; the coöperation aspect may, indeed, be less important there than the conflict aspect. Everywhere is the struggle of one against another, as individuals or as groups. This is social conflict.

These two opposing social processes characterize every society at every stage of development. And each uses the other; armies struggling in conflict, each is itself a coöperating unit of companies and individuals; laborers and capitalists fighting over the problem of wages, each gains strength through coöperating within its own group; so also and equally every coöperating group is likely to contain within itself competing individuals, contending factions, opposing plans and ideals and methods.

Social life evidently exhibits, therefore, two fundamentally opposing tendencies. To analyze these tendencies and to see their causes and results is to understand the nature of social organization.

Social values of conflict. Consider first the fact of conflict. Conflict is struggle, and struggle is universal. Struggle is the putting forth of effort; it is the basis of progress. Usually, however, effort is not exerted except in some sort of group life. All the way from the struggle to get food to the struggle to win the approval of society men assert themselves and show what they can do in the face of other men. Man is continually measuring himself against his fellows. Struggle is thus a social, not an isolated individual process. And also because the supplies of the satisfactions of life are limited — that is, because of the fact of scarcity — struggle is in part an effort to outdo others in order to obtain the goods desired. Struggle or competitive striving is thus of enormous social value in so far as it is a spur or stimulus to finer effort; and always it will be found as fundamental to progress.

Differences in inborn qualities are the beginning of conflict. Increase in such differences arises through variation in habits and knowledge. In addition and of equal importance is the fact that in the more absorbing fields of interest the existence of the same desires in many men must inevitably bring failure of satisfaction for some because of the limitation of the supply of the means of satisfaction. This aspect of conflict is best seen in the struggle to acquire wealth.

The fact that conflict often arises because of difference in qualities of mind or character, whether inborn or acquired, suggests that there must be something of real social value in conflict; since variation in qualities is the basis of effort and of invention, and is thus the key to social development as it also is to evolution in nature. The social value which arises from conflict is found in the incentive to increased productive activity which such conflict develops. Cooley has pointed out that rivalry and emulation are forms of competing struggle which lead to greater excellence of performance on the part of those in conflict. In order to succeed, each is led, under the spell of the desire for the good opinion of society or some other reward, to do a better piece of work than he would have done without the competition of others. The

awarding of prizes to the successful competitor is based upon the idea that competitive conflict has a value in that each competitor is spurred to his greatest effort. Of course there will be social value only if society is wise in setting prizes for really useful activities. If prizes are given for contests in which the results are of no value or even harmful, the greater effort induced produces only more of harm.

Cooley also points out that the system of competitive struggle is a method of assigning people to place in society. There must be some way of determining what shall be the work and the place in society which each shall occupy. An older system by which this was determined was by family, and so the individual was born to a station and to a kind of social activity. The child born in a noble family was thereby chosen to belong to a certain kind of life and work, while a peasant child also found his place determined for him by his birth. But in the system of individual competition, the assumption is that conflict and struggle sift men out according to the type and degree of merit each possesses. It is, of course, unfortunately true in practice that family social position, the favor of friends, and other such factors still have much to do with assigning men to their places in the world, and thus prevent the competitive system from operating.

On the whole, therefore, it may be said that the value of conflict lies first in its stimulus to greater effort, and second in the degree of success it has in trying out and determining the relative fitness of men and ideas.

Social evils of conflict. On the other hand, conflict is the source of great evil. This is due to the fact that other factors than fitness are permitted to determine success, and, second, that the contest itself too often becomes, not a spur to finer effort, but a destruction of one or both contestants. Particularly the element of destructiveness needs emphasis. This is seen in every type of contest from play to industry and war. A drawn game indicates that the rivals are equal and there is nothing to be gained by more contest. In industry, however, or in war, there is no settled method of deciding that the contest shall end because the enemies are of equal strength. Instead, the contest is likely to continue to the partial destruction

of each side, and often also of that part of society which is not engaged in the contest. In the recent war it became clear that the two sides were closely matched and that destruction for each of them was inevitable; and also it was plain that a neutral power was sure to suffer almost equally with the parties to the conflict. It is because of this fact of social destructiveness without possible gain that societies have felt the need of trying to limit, prevent, or modify conflicts. Therefore, rules of play are set up; minimum standards in economic competition are established by law, or methods looking toward arbitration; and so also courts have been organized, and treaties arranged to prevent private warfare or to end national wars. Yet continually the tendency to conflict leads to new struggle, and too often the contending parties are able to defy the rules, the standards, or the laws and treaties set up. To find better methods of limiting or ending conflict is a difficult but vital part of the work of the citizen, and it calls for all the knowledge, the intelligence and the self-control of which men are capable.

When conflict arises out of or expresses important differences between opponents, the long continuance of the conflict intensifies the original difference. It is far easier for them to come to an understanding with each other before conflict has gone far than when the conflict has become embittered by repeated attack and counter-attack. Every notch in the bow of the savage, indicating an enemy slain, was itself an inciter of further new hostility on the part of the enemy. The incidents of the Civil War greatly exaggerated the differences to which economic and social facts gave rise. The *conflict-history* thus tends to become fixed in tradition and to act as an influence which perpetuates the conflict.

Domination and exploitation. Too often conflict becomes a struggle for power and domination. Such conflict is in no way related to the type of conflict which stimulates finer activity and service. It succeeds through destruction or the subordination of one group to another. Domination, subordination, exploitation, are three terms which explain much of the history of conflict, and which express its evil character. Domination refers to the control of men by other men; those controlled are subject to the will of the controllers, as expressed by force and custom; and since they are used

only for the purposes of the dominating powers, they are said to be exploited. Thus the evil in domination and subordination is exploitation. It is a basal principle of social justice that all human life should be thought of and treated not as a thing to be used for some one else, but as having worth in itself. When this principle is denied and men, women, or children are subjected to the wants and purposes of superior power, their lives are exploited and we have an evil world. Much of the evil of life is found in exploitation, and many a conflict is a struggle to get rid of exploitation. Here conflict becomes its own justification; in the nature of things it must lead to the discovery of better modes of coöperation, to the suggestion of new principles of coöperation, and to a clearer understanding of the meaning of the social principles of justice and freedom. When men and nations struggle for freedom, ordinarily freedom means (or is assumed to mean) freedom from exploitation. Examples of domination and exploitation suggest themselves readily. Slavery as an institution is a thorough example of out-and-out exploitation. It could never have existed for the long ages of its history were it not true that conflict so commonly became a struggle for power and domination. Child-labor is another illustration of exploitation, and many additional examples will occur to any thoughtful mind.

It may be concluded, therefore, that the evils of conflict are found first in a tendency, where opponents are somewhat evenly matched, to mutual destruction — a condition which passes over too often to others than those engaged in the conflict; and the second evil is the result of domination and appears in the fact of human exploitation.

Methods used in acquisitive conflict. Thomas Nixon Carver,[1] in discussing methods of acquisition of wealth in the struggle for existence, divides these methods into four varieties: destructive, deceptive, persuasive, and productive. Destructive methods include war, robbery, and violence; deceptive methods are thieving, swindling, etc. These are all evidently evil and to be condemned. Persuasive methods of struggle and acquisition may and should have value, yet too often are productive of evil. They

[1] *Principles of National Economy*, p. 60.

are found in all the relations of social life and may be controlled by enlightened ideas and moral conduct, but easily slide downward and escape such control, the aim thus becoming to acquire by means of persuasion regardless of the value to any one but the receiver of the desired object. Illustrations of persuasive methods are many. Advertising and salesmanship in the commercial world depend in part upon skill in persuasion. Getting one's self or friends elected to office, getting a position in industry, winning a case at law — these in their several fields involve persuasion and are illustrations of personal competition in the struggle to succeed. In so far as they embody a stimulus to finer effort, to inventiveness, to new and constructive activity, or to the explanation and understanding of the truth, there is the possibility of advantage and value to society. But where the 'desire to win' is the supreme principle, persuasive methods become equally evil and degenerative with those called destructive or deceptive. To persuade people to believe what is not true; to induce them to choose ignorant or corrupt leaders, to argue them into prejudiced, unjust, dishonest, or ignorant legal or political action, or to persuade them to buy adulterated or poorly made foods, is in each case a social evil of the most serious consequences. Yet, again, it is to be remembered that it is through the persuasive method that men are organized into new and better types of coöperative effort and are led to appreciate higher standards and finer conduct.

The fourth method of economic struggle is the productive, and is found both in the producing of goods and of services. This is the field of industrial competition. The struggle to live leads to the production of those things by which men live — either directly or through exchange. In the main the productive method of struggle through the creation of economic values leads to social advantage. This is however not true if the object produced be harmful, or the method of production itself be destructive.

Finally, it should be observed that the tendency to use destructive methods of conflict-struggle belongs to the lower orders of life. The greater the ignorance, and the more brutal the standards, the more usual is the use of such methods. It is necessary to recognize once for all that while struggle is socially inevitable and necessary,

the destructive methods of struggle are unwise, leading to social evil and degeneration. Progressive societies have tended to advance from the use of destructive methods to productive and persuasive methods. The social value of education is in part that thereby men are enabled to discover and appreciate the possibilities of progress without the destruction of those who struggle against them.

READING REFERENCES

Carver, T. N.: *Essays in Social Justice*, chs. II, IV, and V.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, part IV.
Russell, Bertrand : *Why Men Fight*, ch. IV.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XII–XVIII.

QUESTIONS

1. Explain the difference between 'conflict' and 'struggle.' Which is the more inclusive term? If five men unite to lift a piano is struggle involved? Is conflict?
2. What social results follow from offering prizes in school contests?
3. Does a system of grading school work have the same purpose?
4. Does the social value from offering prizes to contestants vary with the kind of contest? Compare patents granted to inventors; public office as 'spoils' to a victorious party; money or applause to the winner of a pie-eating contest; wealth to the successful organizer of a business. In the last case does it make any difference what the business is?
5. How does the history of slavery show the evil effects of conflict?
6. In child-labor are the antagonists in the conflict of equal strength? Do the values of stimulation arise here? Why and how does society try to prevent or limit the use of children in industrial conflict?
7. Does war show one or both of the chief evils resulting from conflict?
8. How does the present conflict between France and Germany illustrate the importance of *conflict-history* as compared with inborn differences, as causes of conflict.
9. In theory "competition among men assigns them their places in society." Can all men compete in the same contest or are there many *kinds* of contests adapted to kinds of men? Who determines the 'rules of the game' in any conflict? Besides inborn qualities are there factors or conditions which give one an advantage in competition? Are these factors equally spread over all groups?

CHAPTER XVI

THREE IMPORTANT VARIETIES OR FIELDS OF CONFLICT

SINCE differences among men are almost unlimited in number and variety, conflicts themselves are of many kinds. Nevertheless it is possible to single out certain varieties as particularly important and fundamental because they have to do with deep-seated differences or with dominant interests in life. In our present world three kinds of conflict stand out as of greatest consequence and these it will be well to study in order to understand more clearly the nature of conflict in relation to the organization of society. These are the conflicts between races, between nations, and between classes.

I. RACE CONFLICT OR THE CONFLICT OF COLOR

Why race differences lead to conflict. Differences in race, difficult as they are to describe or classify, give rise to antagonisms and hostilities which are deep-seated and yet of little possible benefit to society. Sympathy and the consciousness of kind tend to unite people and to lead to coöperation, while differences and the observation of unlikeness lead to antipathy and opposition. In the struggle for existence and for power, which is not so much between individuals as it is between groups, sheer physical resemblance — in color, size, hair, etc. — is itself a suggestion of likeness and is one of the usual bases of conflict of group with group. In addition to such easily perceived similar characteristics, in the course of time there develop certain social or cultural uniformities, such as language, religion, and family customs. And these cultural resemblances intensify the consciousness of kind and the sympathetic bond, while exaggerating the differences between groups. There is a distinct difference, it should be remembered, between physical traits or marks and the cultural likenesses. The former are inborn and are inherited, while the latter are a social product and are handed on from the old to the young through association. Practically, however, it is wellnigh impossible to separate these aspects,

and the conflict of races usually reflects not only the "antipathy of color for color," but also of culture for culture.

In addition to these causes, races may become competitors in economic life, competition growing out of the scarcity of the material bases of life. Economic competition between men of the same race leads to conflict, but when found between different races it tends to intensify the consciousness of race differences and to exaggerate race hatred.

Conflict between races is not the same thing as conflict between nations. It might well happen that a nation is largely of one race and culture, but often this is not at all true. A nation may have within it more than one race, and a race may be found in more than one nation.

Conflicts between races are usually not a part of the struggle to live, but rather of the struggle to dominate. They are born out of hostility and hatred for those not like ourselves, together with a belief in our own superiority. Differences in customs and ideas may gradually disappear as people mingle with each other, but differences in the physical marks of race are not overcome except through intermarriage. They thus remain as a constant reminder of difference, and it is easy to assume that all other differences, such as social standing, are the direct outgrowth of race itself. The tendency of conflict is intensified by isolation in so far as isolation increases differences and makes wholesome contacts impossible.[1] Thus ignorance and lack of mutual understanding become important factors in regard to the problem.

On the other hand, however, race conflict is often intensified by the increase of contacts; only, however, if those contacts arise out of some type of economic or social competition. The massing of Japanese in certain irrigated agricultural sections of California has greatly intensified race hatred, but primarily because it has brought about a competition in regard to labor and the ownership of land.

There is no reason to believe that conflicts between races have beneficial results. They have not stimulated competing races to

[1] Separation in place of residence and in social intercourse between negroes and whites breeds suspicion and prevents mutual understanding. This is one of the serious phases, also, of city immigrant colonies.

greater achievement either in economic invention, in scientific discovery, or in political and social relations. In the main, certainly, such conflict is destructive for both parties to the conflict. That there is less rationality in such conflict than in most types of hostility is apparent from the mass of unwarranted assertions and statements which abound in discussion of race problems.

Will the world see, in the future, a great conflict between races? If it should do so, it would be simply as an expression and evidence of the lack of man's reasoned control over his emotions and sentiments. Nevertheless, there are many who speak as though such a conflict were inevitable. In his book called *The Rising Tide of Color*, Stoddard points to the growth of unity within the black race and within the yellow race, each being welded into a firm racial consciousness through its hostility to the domination and assumed superiority of the white race. The possibility of tremendous conflict is evident, and if it is to be averted, it will be only through better understanding of the basis of such conflict and of its uselessness.

At the present time (and for the past hundred or more years) the white race leads in invention and achievement, though this superiority has not always been the case. As a result it has assumed control of large parts of the world the main populations of which are of other races. Unfortunately, too often it has assumed its own superiority and justified its exploitation of the 'inferior' or backward races. Discontent and rebellion in India, Japanese anger against the American, Egyptian demands for independence, and race riots in Chicago or Washington have much in common. They are expressions of a consciousness of race antagonism, an outburst of race hatred, and all point to a social problem and situation of most serious difficulty.

In the United States the race problem appeared in the seventeenth century through the introduction of negro slavery, and this is still our chief and most difficult racial situation. Only second to it in importance is the more recent emergence of the Oriental problem upon the Pacific Coast, beginning with the coming of the Chinese in the middle of the nineteenth century, and passing to the Japanese phase near the end of that century. The latter is, how-

ever, not a race problem exclusively (being equally a problem of national rivalry), yet it is bound to be so considered by the majority of people.

The negro problem. In studying the negro question in the United States, it is well to remember that the ten and one-half million negroes in this country are a part of a world black population estimated at one hundred and fifty million. The main home of this population is the continent of Africa, south of the Desert of Sahara, though many have migrated northward to the Mediterranean and also to parts of Asia.

Two divergent opinions may be found in regard to the characteristics of the black race and its achievements. One group of students claims that the blacks in Africa have accomplished much, in the way of industry, of government, and in the arts. In so far as a lack of achievement may be admitted, it is held to be due to the monotony and uniformity of their environment, to the unfavorable tropical climate, to their comparative isolation from the origin of a few significant inventions and from diffusion routes, and to other external conditions; the general conclusion being that the native quality of the race is fairly equal to that of other races.

The other opinion holds that the black is naturally different in inborn nature from the white, and in intelligence is inferior. It is asserted that he has never gone far in the way of political and social organization, and that, instead, he belongs, in culture, in the age of the childhood of mankind, in spite of occupying a naturally rich physical environment.

It is probably fair to believe that the truth lies somewhere between these two views. The inborn physical marks of the black race are undoubtedly accompanied by some distinctive mental characteristics; and it seems probable that there has been a smaller production of distinctly great minds and of great achievements among them than among the white people. Yet it is undoubtedly true that the great mass is of average and normal mental ability, and does not, in this respect, differ markedly from the mass of the whites. In trying to understand the conflict between black and white, it is not wise to start with the assumption that the negro is an inferior race. It is wiser to try to discover what are and have

been the relations between the two races and whether they may be bettered.

The negro in the United States. The history of the negro problem in the United States began with the slave trade, and its first main period ended with the emancipation of nearly five million slaves in 1863. Without property, without education, without experience or training in independent economic life, the legally free negro entered the uncertain second stage of his life in the New World. In judging his progress since slavery, two things are to be kept in mind: one is his ignorance and his utter lack of property; the other is the assumption — born of his long slavery — that he is inferior to the white and must expect to accept an inferior position in our life. There has, therefore, developed a dual society in those parts of the country where the negro is found; a white society and a negro society: two sets of people separated by color, barred from intermarriage by law in every Southern (and many Northern) States, each having its own institutions. White schools, white churches, white cars, white hotels, white residence districts, are paralleled by negro schools, churches, cars, hotels, and living districts. Economically also the two peoples are separated. In the main the negro works as a laborer for the white, but white labor avoids him. Wherever the negro has gone into business, he serves his own race only; thus negro banks and stores are to be found, and are increasing in number.

Possibilities of adjustment between white and black. This complete separation of two races presents a problem of grave difficulty, for it seems practically impossible for two societies to exist side by side, maintaining their distinct barriers, and at the same time to avoid constant friction and even serious conflict. There may be said to be three possible lines which such separate societies may follow: (1) They may intermingle, disregarding entirely the racial differences. (2) They may maintain separate social systems on the basis of entire equality, legal, political, economic, and educational. (3) Or, as a third plan, they may maintain separate social systems, but on the basis of a relationship of superiority and subordination, one society ruling the other and using it largely for its own purposes.

Race prejudice between white and black tends to make the first impossible, as evidenced by the laws against intermarriage in each of the Southern States, and by the intensifying rather than weakening on the part of the white society of the determination to prevent intermingling. The second alternative is an ideal held by many white and negro leaders, but is enormously difficult to realize. To supply as many schools and as good ones for the negro as for the white; to make possible for the negro an equal economic opportunity, guaranteed by an administration of laws in which he can expect even justice, is a task which calls for a high sense of social obligation and a willingness to make great sacrifices. It is greatly to be commended that in recent years there has come about in the South a recognition of this aim and that there is a distinct and growing movement of interchange of ideas and of desire for mutual understanding of the views and needs of the negro.

Nevertheless, it must be said that the tendency toward the third alternative — accepted during the age of slavery — is still overwhelmingly strong and represents the opinion of very many of the white race. And out of it comes constant conflict, often ending in riots or in lynching. Conflict of this kind does not lead to betterment; it is not improving the negro character nor is it developing the life of the white race. The great need is for a spirit and plan of coöperation to take the place of conflict; but these must be the result of slow education of both peoples, an education primarily in regard to the nature of their life together.

Social aspects of the negro problem. It is well to realize some aspects of the present position of the negro in America, and to understand what of progress he has made.

The negro population in the United States is concentrated in the States of the South, more than three quarters living in the region known as the "black belt." In South Carolina and Mississippi negroes make more than one half of the total population, while in Georgia and Louisiana more than one third is negro. The concentration is not only geographical, but industrial, the greater part of the negroes being found in agriculture and therefore living in rural life rather than in cities. The population of certain rural counties in Mississippi is eighty per cent negro.

The growth of the total negro population since the Civil War has been rapid, but on the whole it has not kept pace with the growth of the white population. From the first census taken in 1790 to the present time, the negro percentage of the total population of the United States has steadily declined; in 1790 the negroes constituted one fifth of the population, while in 1920 they were one tenth. Nevertheless, there has been a large increase in absolute numbers — from 757,000 in 1790 to 10,463,131 in 1920.

One evident explanation of the slower growth of negro population is the high death rate. This shows itself in infant mortality, and in certain serious diseases such as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and syphilis. These facts are in part an indication of the socially inferior position of the negro, his poverty and inferior opportunity in the way of sanitation, housing, and medical and hospital care; but they are in part also due to weakened constitutions resulting from ignorance and lack of moral control.

Negro criminality and vice are out of proportion to the size of the negro population; and these tendencies are more marked as the negro goes North and into city life. To account for this condition two kinds of explanation are given. The possible inborn difference between whites and blacks in inherited traits, due to the negro's life in the tropics and to his slight period of adaptation to modern social life, may account for his asserted lack of self-control. But his social position, both now and during his brief history in America, is also of importance as a factor. His inferior social status as a slave and his present position of economic and social inferiority certainly have not suggested self-restraint and an observance of social order. The more he becomes conscious of these inferiorities and recognizes the way he is looked down upon by the white, the less likely is he to respect the laws and regulations set by white society. The wild outbreaks against him of violence and hatred manifested in horrible lynchings of most brutal ferocity do not lessen his crime, but probably, through suggestion and anger, lead to greater criminality on his part.

Usually, where differing peoples are in conflict with each other, intermarriage or interbreeding between them may be expected to bring conflict to an end. But intermixture between white and

black does not have this result. In the first place every Southern State and many of the Northern States forbid by law such intermarriage. Whatever mixture of blood takes place is therefore through illegitimate unions, mainly between white males and negro females. But race antipathy has also brought it about that all those of mixed blood are classed as blacks, and their position is no better, as far as white society is concerned, than that of the pure-blooded blacks. Biologically there is little evidence that such a mixture of blood has any bad consequences, but socially the result is more or less disastrous. The vice surroundings which so frequently are associated with such unions, as well as the social ostracism which follows the offspring of them, are important social causes of the larger amount of crime committed by this part of the negro race.

How large a part of the total black population is really of mixed blood it is impossible to say. Census figures of a certainty are not to be relied upon, since it is impossible to have all instances reported. For 1910 the census reports one fifth of the negroes as of mixed blood. Careful students of the problem estimate that at least one third of the negroes have white blood, the per cent being lowest in the rural black belt, and rising to probably one half the negro population in the 'border' States. If the recent pronounced tendency of the negro to migrate to Northern cities should continue, there is every reason to believe that the mixture of blood will continue to increase, though still not through legal marriages.

It may well be, indeed, that the continued migration of the negro to the Northern and Western States may do more to change the relations between the two races than anything else.[1] To thin out the 'black belt' by the spread of this dense population to other parts of the country, while perhaps leading to an increase of race antipathy in Northern cities, would greatly improve the opportunity for social progress in the more backward black sections of the South. Undoubtedly the migration of negroes to the cities of the North which was so marked a movement during the Great War, and which still continues, is one of the most striking and significant

[1] It is estimated that more than half a million negroes have migrated from the South to the North within the past ten years.

social developments in the negro problem. The change in industrial conditions and in social contacts and education, with the accompanying mental stimulation and aroused ambitions, together with intenser competition, degenerative temptations, and severer conditions of sickness and disease, make a new environment which may greatly change negro life and character. The fact of his high city death rate, however, is of prime importance in judging the future of this migratory movement.

Perhaps the most important phase of the negro problem is the relation of the negro to industry. Sixty years ago he was a slave. He owned no property; "ninety-nine per cent were penniless field hands or servants." He was illiterate and without education. His industrial life was not such as to train him in habits of steadiness and foresight, of thrift and self-denial. In 1900 there were still living in the South negroes who were born in Africa. To-day, though legally free, poverty and ignorance are conspicuously characteristic of him, and his progress must depend upon education and improvement in his industrial capacity and position. Booker T. Washington's emphasis upon industrial education, in his school at Tuskegee, Alabama, is the outgrowth of the belief that social advance for the negro can come only through his acquisition of property, and this will depend upon the growth of industrial skill and knowledge. At present the indications are that without this training he is losing ground in competition with the white in all the occupations he has entered. Even as a farm laborer or farmer, while there are many individual instances of progress toward ownership, there is much indication that the negro as a whole will not be able to hold his own against incoming white labor, such as the Italian.

Certainly it is impossible to expect great improvement without more and better education. Over forty per cent of the negro children of the South do not attend school, and almost twenty-three per cent of the population over ten years of age is illiterate.[1] While $10 per capita is spent upon the education of white children in the South, only $2.86 per capita is spent upon the education of negro children. Education for efficiency in industry is specially needed for the children of a poverty-stricken people in order that they may

[1] United States Census, 1920.

improve their economic life as a basis for progress in other regards; yet not over one per cent of negro children are given any industrial education. Until something like reasonable opportunity — educational and economic — is given him, it is impossible to determine whether the negro can prove himself equal to the white man.

Evidently friction and conflict do not better the situation. Instead they have bred injustice and misunderstanding. They have intensified hatreds and have weakened efforts to meet acknowledged evils. That the negro problem is a serious one is beyond dispute, but the first requisite toward its improvement is the determination of leaders of both races to coöperate in thought and action. Injustice is the basis of hatred; justice and coöperation are the only possible basis for a new life.

Chinese and Japanese. Of quite a different character has been the conflict between the white population and the Oriental races on the Pacific Coast. Here there is no question of the inferiority or superiority of races. The yellow and brown men are in all probability on a par in natural capacity with the white man, and careful scholars do not describe either of these peoples as of naturally inferior intelligence. Their acquired characteristics, however, which are the product of quite different civilizations, separate them from the whites and make social unity difficult. The contact of white and Oriental upon the Pacific Coast has extended over a period of seventy-five years, and has been a continuous record of race misunderstanding, prejudice, and conflict. In the case of both the Chinese and the Japanese, hostile private, municipal, and State legislative action, principally in California, has led finally to action by the United States Government limiting or forbidding the incoming of any considerable numbers of these races. Probably no one would pretend that all of this legislation or private action, has been just or fair.[1] It is recognized that it is the outgrowth of the feeling of members of one race toward another, and is expressive of certain popular beliefs in regard to race mixture. Such an expression, used

[1] An interesting example was the San Francisco anti-Chinese laundry license. By this ordinance a license fee of $2 per quarter was levied on one-horse delivery vehicles; $4 per quarter on two-horse vehicles; and $15 per quarter on horseless (Chinese) vehicles. So, vegetable men using a wagon were taxed $2 while those who did not use a wagon (Chinese) were taxed $10.

in regard to both Chinese and Japanese, as "they cannot be assimilated," is not a scientific (that is, carefully tested) truth, but is simply an evidence of dislike. Evidently the inborn physical and possibly mental differences between Oriental and white races, increased and emphasized by widely differing social life or cultures, is the basis of prejudice and antagonism. And in addition there has arisen economic competition or struggle for economic opportunities which are always limited. The latter fact is quite as important as the former. As long as the Orientals were here in small numbers and engaged in activities which did not compete with the whites, race prejudice was at a minimum. Only when numbers became large and they became economic competitors with their white neighbors did race hostility grow into anger and violence.

It is probably the opinion of most observers of this conflict that the sheer difficulty of bringing about coöperation between races whose differences are both inborn and acquired makes it advisable to avoid conflict if possible, and therefore a thorough restriction upon the incoming of Oriental races for other purposes than travel or study is accepted as wise. This is not the same thing as saying that these divergent races may not have varied and profitable relations with each other. The constant intermingling in trade and in culture, the gradual building of common understanding through the spread of education and common ideas, will undoubtedly in time remove to some extent hostilities that now exist. But to attempt to throw together large bodies of the two races, particularly of those members who are least educated and who must compete with each other for a living, is certain to lead to so great friction that it is wise to take serious measures to avoid it.

The Chinese in the United States. The Chinese began coming to the Pacific Coast as early as 1848. By 1876 a Congressional commission estimated that, allowing for returning numbers and for deaths, the Chinese population in the United States had reached 114,000; while the census of 1880 gave the number as 105,000. By this time race hostilities had become serious. Anti-Chinese riots were of frequent occurrence both in California and in other Pacific States. Large numbers of Chinese were murdered, the murderers going unpunished. In 1882 Congress passed the so-called Exclusion

Act, which suspended for ten years the immigration of Chinese laborers and forbade the naturalization of Chinese. The main features of this law were embodied in the treaty of 1894 between China and the United States, and when, after ten years, China refused to renew this treaty, Congress passed, in 1904, the present Exclusion Law, by which all Chinese are forbidden entrance to the United States except merchants, travelers, and students, who must obtain at the port of departure a certificate signed by the American consul. Since this date the number of Chinese in America has gradually decreased, and with the decrease in their numbers has come a marked change in the white sentiment toward them. It is common now to hear the Chinese spoken of with approval and often with admiration.

The Japanese in the United States. The coming of the Japanese to the United States began about 1880, and by 1910 the number had reached 148,000. Just as with the increase of Chinese immigrants, hostility grew against the Japanese as their numbers grew. So bitter had this feeling become, as manifested not only in personal relations, but also in State and municipal law, that in 1907 President Roosevelt brought about an arrangement with Japan known as the 'Gentlemen's Agreement.' To avoid the unnecessary arousing of the antagonism of the Japanese Government by the passage of an exclusion law like that which was in operation against the Chinese, this 'agreement' was simply an understanding that the Japanese Government would not permit Japanese laborers to come to the United States. It had the effect of excluding laborers, but placed the administration in the hands of the Japanese Government.

Meanwhile the rapid growth in power and influence of the Japanese nation since its war with Russia in 1905, and the expansion of its commerce, particularly in the Pacific Ocean, has brought about an increase of relations with the United States, but also an intenser competition; and the growth of competition has strengthened the race hostility. In spite of the fact that the Japanese population in the United States is only 111,000, as shown by the census of 1920, and though there is reason to believe that under the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' the number would eventually decrease rather than

the opposite, national commercial competition prevents the conflict of races from dying out. In 1924 Congress passed a new immigration law which contains a provision for the complete exclusion of Japanese from the United States. This law, while only slightly modifying the total number of the Japanese in the United States (since relatively few were being admitted under the 'Gentlemen's Agreement') has aroused resentment among the Japanese and may seriously affect the relations between the two countries.

It is greatly to be hoped that a better understanding of the facts and character of the problem may prevent needless hostility. Certainly the stimulation of race anger in the supposed interest of national commercial ambition is both stupid and immoral. The growth of commerce between the Japanese and American people is bound to continue and to become of steadily increasing importance and benefit to both nations. It is inconceivable that race hostility, unintelligent and vicious in character, should be permitted to destroy these mutual values and should array these nations against each other in destructive warfare.

Summary. Race conflict is thus seen to have many forms. It is always unreasoning in character, and exaggerates minor superficial differences among men. It is the basis for the most unjust and cruel acts of which man is capable. Under its instigation men are tortured, hanged, or burned to death. Hatreds thrive upon it; by it evil impulses are given free rein. A thoughtful foreigner,[1] observing the prejudice between the immigrants of varied nationalities and races in America, writes: "I have seen prejudice, like an evil shadow everywhere. It lurks at every corner, in every street, and in every mart. I have seen it in the car and on the train; I have felt its dreaded power in school and college, in clubs and churches. It is an ever-present evil spirit, felt, though unseen, wounding hearts, cutting souls. It passes on its poison like a serpent from generation to generation." It builds barriers between men and prevents the progress of mankind. It is a factor of sheer destruction, and the only possibility of overcoming it lies in the building of coöperations between alien races. These coöperations may be

[1] Panunzio, C. M.: *The Soul of an Immigrant*, p. 82. Copyright, by The Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

educational, they may be industrial, they may be political. Such is the purpose of the efforts of the higher order of statesmen and leaders among the Oriental and white races in regard to the Pacific, and among the negro leaders of the South such as Booker T. Washington. Such coöperative efforts must embody definite interracial activities and better understanding each of the other, and must rest upon certain accepted fundamental principles of social life — principles of justice and mutual respect.

II. Conflict between Nations

The term 'nation' as here used refers to a people united in and by a single government. It is not necessary that such a people should belong to a single race; the contrary is quite frequently the case. The unity of the nation is not, therefore, based on inborn likeness, but on those social customs and traditions which make up the social heritage and which direct the thinking and form the sentiments and habits of a people. A common language is usual, but not inevitable. Common ways, common industrial interests, and a single government are the essential bases of national unity.

Evolution of conflict group units. Conflict between nations rests, as does conflict between races, first, upon difference in characteristics and interests mainly resulting from differences in history and culture; and, second, upon the scarcity of the means of satisfying wants. The first of these factors is psychological, expressing attitudes of mind, the second is economic. Because the mental differences between nations are not inborn, they are less deep-seated and are easier to surmount than in the case of races. The conflict over the means of satisfying material wants — the economic factor — is constant and more and more dominates the struggle between nations.

While the tendency to struggle and the instinct of pugnacity are inborn, the expression or direction of these tendencies has always depended upon social custom. It is not necessary, nor has it always been true, that these instincts found expression through nations. Other groups have been the chief conflict units. Thus, in simple early life the injury of one person by another led to a family or clan feud, that is, the families or clans of the two persons became

the units or groups carrying on conflict — not nations. It was assumed to be proper for such kinship groups to defend their members or to make aggression against other similar groups. In a later age nobles with their retainers or dependents entered into conflict with other nobles and their dependents, and such conflict was accepted as regular and permissible. In still a different age cities (commercial centers) struggled against other cities in defense of members or in the effort to destroy rivals. In each of these cases the same kind of conflicts existed as are now found between nations, and in each case these conflicts were at one time approved and later came to be forbidden. Why did this change in the group or unit of conflict take place?

The reason for this change is found in the fact that in each of these cases — kinship group, feudal manor, commercial city — the inclusive unit of social life itself is the group in question, *and a change in the unit of social life changes the unit of conflict.* The organization of social life varies with knowledge and general conditions; particularly is the character of the economic life the basis of the size and character of these social organizations. Thus family conflicts were eventually limited or forbidden when society ceased to be organized on the basis of kinship authority; and instead feudal nobility came to embody supreme authority and power, and therefore to be the accepted unit of conflict. So also the feudal right of conflict — noble against noble — ultimately passed out of the customs and ways of men, when cities became centers of commerce, and a growing commercial life shifted authority and power from the rural and agricultural economy of feudalism to the city centers of commerce and trade. Whatever of value may have arisen from conflicts between these family or feudal groups ceased to be of importance in the growing interrelations of newer and more complicated economic social life. The system of living — the economy — of the newer organizations of society could not exist if the older group units were to continue their conflicts, at least in the way of mutual destruction.

Out of this confusion of smaller contending groups grew nations, and nations are representative simply of larger and more complex social relations among people, developing gradually common cul-

ture and ideals as well as an interrelated economic life and a single government. The nation thus became the seat of authority; power passed from family, noble, or city to the nation; and so conflict is made by nations, and, naturally, against, not individuals, but other nations.

Why conflict between nations is harmful. Nations engage in conflict for many reasons, but primarily the reasons have to do with the desire for power; that is, it is an expression of the struggle for domination. While it is largely, therefore, economic, each is actuated by a consciousness of its own life and by loyalty to its own standards and ideals. The long-continued use of the nation as the supreme unit of conflict gradually has intensified national sentiments and emotions, until it seems inevitable that each nation should contend against others. This fosters the idea that loyalty to the nation necessitates hostility to other nations, and so it becomes easy for nations to sanction and approve their own domination over other nations and their exploitation or even extermination of them. Remembering, however, that nations have tended to be economic rivals, just as independent cities or feudal manors have been in other ages, it becomes clear that the life of mankind may reach a point where conflict between nations is *essentially destructive because the economic interrelations are so intimate and so vital that such conflict destroys rather than builds up the economic system or organization of the life of mankind.* If economic life — commerce, finance, labor — should less and less depend upon, observe, and use, national lines, spreading freely the network of its organization across national boundaries or disregarding them entirely, then conflict between nations is bound to destroy this organization and national conflicts become an overwhelming evil. Apparently such a condition has now been reached in the development of the life of mankind. This will become clearer as the methods of conflict are discussed, but it is evident that the supreme need of civilization to-day is to devise means of coöperation between nations to take the place of international conflicts. Just as in earlier ages conflict between families or between feudal nobles was ended through inventing methods of coöperation in larger units, so conflict between nations must end through adoption of coöperative international organization. This

does not mean, of course, that nations should cease to be active and vigorous factors in the world's life, any more than families or cities have ceased to be vital group factors in social life. It means only that they — for their own sake as well as others — must substitute, for the idea of advance through dominating or overthrowing other nations, the idea of coöperation because of the close interrelationships of the people and life of the world regardless of national limits.

III. Conflict between Classes

The basis of class division. The third type of conflict which dominates the world is the conflict between classes. In every society which has advanced beyond the most simple and primitive organization, there are found divisions or classes, each of which occupies a somewhat distinct social position or status. The marks which distinguish one class from another are many, indicating the fact that classes gradually accumulate distinguishing characteristics, through the varying and complex aspects of their social history. Nevertheless, though the term 'class' is social, and each class is marked by the characteristics of its social position, the basis and foundation of classes is economic. Differences in the ownership of wealth — that is to say, in property — lie at the root of class differences. Wealth makes leisure possible, and wealth and leisure together create the opportunity for culture. Wealth also gives power over men, and the holder of power may demand privileges. Privileges, culture, leisure, together with the social manners which grow from them, tend to constitute a special status or social position separating its members from the class or classes which do not hold this status.

A second factor in the making of classes is inheritance of position. If custom and law sanction the handing-on of wealth through family inheritance, the marks of class become more firmly fixed; class consciousness is developed, and the barriers between classes are higher and harder to climb over.

Reversing the case, those who have little wealth find opportunities more limited. Leisure is denied; education and culture become difficult or impossible; the nature of their work modifies manners and gives them a different point of view as well as different stand-

ards of action. An additional factor in early days often played a part in class conflict. This is the fact that one class constituted a conquering group, while the other or others were the conquered. Thus in early Rome the patricians are thought to have been conquerors over the Latin clans which constituted the plebeians. Where conquest complicates the situation, class conflict has shown great bitterness.

In feudal ages economic life rested on agriculture; land was the basis of wealth, of power, and of human relationships; and classes are founded upon these facts. Thus there existed a landowning class and a non-landholding or serf class. The overthrow of this entire system closely follows the rise of a new basis of wealth and new property, through changes in technology. New commercial wealth brings a commercial class; machinery makes possible an industrial wealth class. The withdrawal of property privileges, such as exemption from taxation, is the beginning of the overthrow of the landowning aristocracy and its power as a class.

Wherever it is easy for all kinds of men to acquire wealth, the barriers of class are slight; and the same is true wherever the division of wealth is fairly even. Thus free land in the United States in time overcame class traditionalism. But if wealth is held by a few and the remainder find it difficult to become holders of property, class lines begin to be noticed, class privileges to be emphasized, class hatreds to become intense.

Thus the struggle for wealth, which is a struggle for a livelihood, a struggle for power, and a struggle for a social status, is not only a competition between individuals, but is primarily a conflict of group with group; these groups are known as *social classes*, and *the division of society into classes tends to prevent the movement and activity of individuals according to their ability and value to society.* The ownership of wealth or the institution of private property is thus the basis of class conflict. This is a part of the study of the entire economic life of society which is outlined in Part III; but it will be described here in so far as is necessary to see its relation to social conflict as a whole.

The assumed social function of private property. Private property is the most fundamental economic institution of society.

Every settled arrangement or institution of society has a work to accomplish, commonly spoken of as its 'function.' The right of private property — that is, the right to own — exercised by individuals or small groups considered by society as individuals — such as the family or corporation — rests upon the idea that society gains something or is bettered through this kind of ownership compared with common or general social ownership of wealth. All wealth is produced through some social-economic system; it is not a case of each individual by himself producing — this is rarely done except in the most isolated life; but production of wealth is by groups and according to certain accepted ideas and certain standards of knowledge and skill which each society has reached and approved. "No man liveth unto himself" was not spoken about the economic life, yet of no aspect of life is it more true. If men were to try, each by himself, to produce what is necessary to live upon, the entire earth would support but a few hundred thousand scattered savages. It is by organized, interdependent, group production, that the world lives, and the world's wealth is the result of the combined activities, based upon accepted ideas of society in regard to the direction and organization of the work itself. One of these accepted ideas is private ownership of the wealth produced, and the universal existence of this idea and institution is evidence that society believes that it is of use, not only to the individual owner, but to society itself.

What service to society is it supposed that private property performs? Assuming that man is led to act, in part, by inborn instincts, and that the desires to live, to acquire, and to have power are all based upon such inborn instinctive drives, it is evident also that the production of wealth is an essential of social welfare. To increase that wealth is to make possible the lifting of the standard of life of society and the enrichment of that life itself. Societies, therefore, have asked themselves, "By what incentive can we persuade men to produce more wealth?" And their usual answer has been: "If you produce, you may own the wealth you make." Thus every discovery, it is thought, may ultimately increase the wealth, not only of individuals, but of the entire people, the system of production will be more efficient, and the material life of the people

safer. *The social utility and function of private property is that it leads to the increased production of wealth.* It is necessary to appreciate this principle thoroughly in order to recognize the great place in society which private property as an accepted principle and institution holds.

If wealth may be owned by individuals or by family or corporate groups, it at once becomes the basis of conflict. Wealth is limited, and what one man has another cannot have: this is the beginning of economic conflict. Moreover, a little wealth is the key to more wealth; it unlocks not only social position and influence, but also economic opportunity. Hence the saying, 'wealth breeds wealth.' The effort of those who have wealth is, therefore, likely to be directed toward the making of more wealth, while those who have little or no wealth struggle to find their way into the wealth-owning group or class.

The effort to acquire property is not necessarily productive. In the conflict over property it becomes clear that the individual is often struggling, not to produce, but to acquire it, and these two motives have very different social value and result. Society's chief interest in the matter is to induce men to produce wealth, but if it uses the bait of private ownership, it must expect that many will be interested only in acquiring what is already produced. Following Carver's classification, it may be said that individuals obtain wealth either through "earnings, findings, or stealings." Society as distinguished from individuals, obtains wealth through production and discovery or "findings." Inevitably societies have from earliest times, therefore, placed certain limits upon individual acquisition of private property, the kind and degree of limitation naturally changing somewhat to correspond to different types or ages of social life. The prime limitation has been placed upon stealings, and this both because the institution of private property itself is threatened by theft, and the incentive to produce and earn is thereby taken away. "Thou shalt not steal" is, therefore, the first social limit placed by society upon acquisition of wealth, and much of the law of every society has to do with the description, analysis, and execution of this limitation. Closely akin to outright theft are certain activities of acquisition which have the same social

result, such as swindling, gambling, adulterating, etc. Each of these involves acquisition by means of kinds of deceptive behavior which destroy the basis of productive effort and so are destructive in the same way that theft is.

In addition, societies have always limited private property by the assertion of the superior claim of society itself. Societies do not hesitate to take property for social purposes, though, in the interest of preserving the value to society of the individual's interest in property, usually payment is made for what is taken. Moreover, societies have not recognized nor enforced the prohibition upon stealing in a complete way. They have forbidden individual theft, but have sanctioned and even approved of robbery against other peoples or societies. Thus to plunder the enemy is a method of acquisition of property which has had a different social standing from robbery of one man by another.

Society's main purpose in recognizing private property is, however, to stimulate production of wealth. Production involves the growing or making of things or values, the performance of direct services or the organization of men into producing groups. The latter of these is as much a part of production as the former, though it takes a different sort of ability: one is a technical problem and involves science and skill; the other is an organizing problem and calls for an understanding of men and the art of handling them either directly, as in a factory, or indirectly through persuasion. Through these means society brings wealth into existence.

Present criticism of existing ownership of wealth. At the present time there is more or less dissatisfaction with the institution of private property. (1) It is believed by many that it does not well perform the social function which has justified its existence and should be limited in new ways; while (2) others hold that the production of wealth for society can better be brought about by an appeal to other than acquisitive motives in man and by some form of direct collective or community organization and management of production.

It is not possible in an outline such as this to do more than state these positions. Both believe that the existing distribution of wealth is bad. They point to well-known facts such as the follow-

ing: Professor Taussig tells us [1] that (1899 to 1909) "in Great Britain only one out of six adults leaves at death as much as £100 of property, and only one out of twenty leaves as much as £1000." He adds that in a total population of 43,000,000 about 5,000,000 persons belong to families which receive one half the total income, while the remaining 38,000,000 receive the other half.

The National Bureau of Economic Research in its study (1921) of incomes in the United States shows that, in 1918 for the 37,000,000 persons receiving income, 842,458 persons — less than 3 per cent of the total number receiving income — received as much as $5000. The number receiving less than $1500 was 27,056,344, equal to 72 per cent of the total; while 14,558,224 (or 38 per cent) receive less than $1000. Of the upper 3 per cent of incomes, 254,000 persons (less than 1 per cent) received $10,000 or more, their total income being nearly $7,000,000,000; while 21,453 persons had incomes of $50,000 or more, and 152 persons received incomes of $1,000,000 or more, 2,027,554 persons received incomes less than $500. Also "the poorest 70 per cent of income receivers had about 42½ per cent of the national income," while "the richest 30 per cent had about 57½ per cent of the national income." [2]

W. I. King (1915) found that the richest 2 per cent of the population owned 60 per cent of the wealth; the next 33 per cent owned 35 per cent of the wealth; and the poorest class, constituting 65 per cent of the population, owned 5 per cent of the wealth.[3]

Land-ownership shows the same tendency toward concentration. "Over fifty per cent of the ground of England is owned by 2250 persons." [4] Nine families own most of the land constituting the metropolitan area of London. "Nine tenths of Scotland is owned by 1700 persons." [5] "In the United States there are 841,000,000 acres of cultivable land. In 1900 over 200,000,000 acres were in estates which exceeded 1000 acres. Their average size was 4230 acres, and they were owned by less than 50,000 people or .0006 per cent of the population. Many of these estates exceed a hundred thousand acres; many equal five hundred thousand acres; some of

[1] *Principles of Economics*, vol. II, pp. 255–58.
[2] *Income in the United States*, p. 142.
[3] *Wealth and Income in the United States.*
[4] Sims: *Ultimate Democracy and Its Making*, p. 204. [5] *Ibid.*

them exceed a million acres." [1] The Report of the Bureau of Corporations for 1914 shows that 1694 persons or corporations own most of the timber of the United States; sixteen hold 47,000,000 acres; three own 14 per cent. Eleven railroads (closely interrelated in control) own 87 per cent of the anthracite coal of the United States.

Nearly all the great fortunes of a million dollars or over in the United States result from control of natural resources or from speculation. Of 4047 millionaire fortunes investigated, "78 per cent were derived from permanent monopoly privileges." [2]

President Hadley writes: "The forces of democracy on one side, divided between the executive and the legislature, are set over against the forces of property on the other, with the judiciary as arbiter between them." [3]

On the basis of such facts the demand is made by many that society itself shall directly control and manage the actual process of production. It is held that it is not necessary to appeal to the acquisitive desires — the desire to own or to make profit — in order to get men to invent, to organize, or to work; the appeal to the desire to create, to achieve results, to serve fellow-men, will equally tend to the production of wealth. Those who hold this view would not destroy all private property, but they would forbid property in the more important means of production such as machinery and raw material, because they believe that the power which private ownership of these means of production gives to individual or corporate owners is harmful to the welfare and even safety of society. Socialism — using the word in its larger and less technical sense — holds this position. Socialists differ from each other in many ways and divide into strongly opposing groups. They are united, however, in their opposition to individual or private ownership of the means of production and its complete control of the methods of production. All would agree that capital or the machinery and basis of production should be controlled by society or its communities, though they differ radically in their understanding of how

[1] Howe: *Revolution and Democracy*, pp. 44–45.
[2] Commons: *The Distribution of Wealth*, p. 252.
[3] *The Independent*, April 16, 1908.

society should carry out its organization and who or what constitute the community.

The first of the two positions in criticism of existing ownership of property described above recognizes, as does the last, the evils of the bad distribution of wealth. It stands upon the principle that property is not a natural right, but a social principle approved by society because of the function which private property performs. Primarily, as previously stated, the principle is that of *service to social welfare.* Every institution or organization is justified in so far as it performs for society a valuable function — that is, a service. It is urged, therefore, that where wealth is evenly distributed the incentive to produce is spread over all elements of the population and a maximum of invention and production results; but if property is massed in the hands of a few, only these few are stimulated to produce, so that the social purpose of property is largely defeated. Such criticism leads to the suggestion, not that private property be largely given up as an institution, but that it be limited, where it does not perform its function, in the interest of a more even distribution of wealth. Those who hold this view emphasize the distinction between *property for use and property for power.* They point to great family fortunes as exaggerated through the idea of family inheritance without limit. More and more the right of individual or family control of inheritance should yield to the claim of society. The movement in this direction has already gone far through inheritance taxes, but many believe it should go much farther.

In the same way this doctrine would lead to regulation of landholding, restricting private ownership to the extent that land is or can be used. And it would try to find methods of preventing monopoly because of the immense power over the lives of others which monopoly gives.

It would thus try to limit acquisition and the making of individual profit by the demand that private property must first serve social welfare if it is to exist, and so, as new forms of wealth arise and new conditions of production are created, these must be subjected to those limitations on ownership which safeguard the rights and welfare of society.

Property is thus the basis of continual social conflict. Those who have are opposed to those who have not. Class strife grows through the development of class consciousness, and the latter is the offspring of privilege which comes to the holders of wealth and power. In an earlier society than our own, slavery was a distinct institution of society, marking the inferior class position of those who do not own. The slave who owned nothing existed for the sake of the leisured and propertied class. Slavery is fortunately extinct, at least in the western world. But too much of the idea and position of an exploited class remains with regard to the propertyless classes of our own civilization. No greater or more difficult social problem faces our world than the conflict over property.

Labor and capital as classes. A somewhat different aspect of class conflict is found in the struggle between labor and capital. Here the conflict has to do with the different economic as well as social position of the two different factors or elements in production — capital and labor. On the one hand is the worker who does not own the materials and technique of production, and on the other is the capitalist owner and manager. The conflict between them is of two sorts; first, there is the conflict over the division of the product (called the 'wage problem') which becomes a case of property conflict; and, second, there is the conflict in regard to the direction and organization of production, the capitalist insisting upon the right to direct because he owns the capital, while labor demands a voice in management (or even complete control) because his coöperation is essential to production.

The wage question. In regard to the wage problem, it is enough at this point [1] to recognize that inadequate wages are at the basis of many of the social evils of our age. Disease, bad housing, ignorance, degeneration, and crime rest in considerable part upon the failure of wages or income to provide opportunity for vigor, reasonable home life, education, and wholesome recreation. It is not strange that there should be constant demand on the part of wage-earners for an improvement in their income. The modern press and the city street make known in fullest fashion the existence of goods made to satisfy wants. Men, women, and children see the

[1] Further discussion of this problem in Part III, Chapter XXIV.

wealth of the world tantalizingly held before their eyes; they feel strongly also the unsatisfied impulses to feed the most necessary wants — food, clothing, housing, medical care. Knowing their own wants and seeing the means of satisfaction, working sometimes, indeed usually, severely or exhaustingly and yet with meager pay, their feeling of injustice rises and they are angered against the holders of capital whose incomes seem to grow while labor's income is at a standstill.

It is enough to give the following facts to illustrate the thought: The Commission on Industrial Relations reported in 1916 [1] that from one fourth to one third of men eighteen years of age or above working in factories or mines received less than $15 per week. It stated also that nearly three fourths of women who worked in factories, stores, and laundries were paid less than $8 per week, and nearly one half received less than $6. Infant mortality was found by the Children's Bureau [2] to vary from 168 per 1000 in families in which the father earned less than $450 per year to 64 per 1000 if the father's income was $1250 or over. The Industrial Welfare Commission of California [3] in 1916 found that 53 per cent of women at work in all industries investigated were receiving less than $10 per week, though that amount was then considered a bare minimum for physical needs.

The question of the control of the processes of production. Not only, however, is the conflict waged over the ownership of wealth, which is the joint product of labor and capital, but there is also a growing difference of opinion and consequent conflict over the entire organization of the processes of production. The demand for shorter hours, for sanitary and safe conditions of work, for a voice in determining how working groups shall be handled (employed, discharged, rewarded, penalized, disciplined, trained), and for representation in the organizing of the technical and financial parts of the business itself, are aspects of a common protest against what is known as the exclusive capitalist control of industry. Moreover, there is also a protest against the mechanizing character of produc-

[1] Commission on Industrial Relations: *Final Report*, p. 31.
[2] Children's Bureau: *Annual Report* 1918, p. 11.
[3] Industrial Welfare Commission, California; *Report* 1917–18, p. 9.

tion. Machinery has undermined the skill of workers in many industries, and has subjected man to the machine as a producer. The consequence has been to take the interest out of work. Men work far too much because they must live, and far too little because they are interested in doing things which they understand and delight in. To bring the laborer into such relation to production that it shall seem to be *his* work, and so stimulate his interest and activity, is a problem which labor feels is a phase of the question of the control and management of industry itself. The importance of this question to the capitalist is also great, since lack of interest on the part of the worker slows up production and lessens the output, as well as breeding discontent.

Struggle of labor to improve its position. From the days of serfdom and slavery, labor has striven to improve its social position; and with the spread of education and the enlargement of the means and methods of communication, this effort has gradually become a great struggling, organizing, and at times revolutionary, movement of peoples of every country and race. The organization of skilled labor into trade unions is a part of this struggle; legislation by governments in protection of child and women workers, toward limitation of hours, guarding of machinery, compensation for industrial accident (brought into existence, in the main, since labor has obtained the right to vote) are other aspects of the common effort of labor to improve its social position.

The most formidable weapon used in the conflict between labor and capital is the strike. This is possible only where labor is organized — that is, where it can act as a unit. It has come to be recognized as a legal method of action as long as it does not sanction violence. It is, in theory, a united protest of workers against some real or assumed evil in their industry; its purpose is to stop industry till the grievance is adjusted. The obstacle to the success of strikes, from the worker's viewpoint, is the lack of the means of living while the strike is going on. From the employer's point of view the failure of income and stagnation of his business are involved.

From the point of view of society as a whole, it is easy to see that any internal strife interferes with the ordered life essential to a good

social system. If strikes lead to violence, life as well as the institution of property is threatened. But in modern life there is a more serious danger because involving more widespread evil. The industrial life of our time is very complex; one industry depends upon another; failure in one strikes at the existence of others; life is not single or organized by single and separate industrial groups, but is a closely interrelated industrial system, like a pattern woven from a multitude of threads. Some industries are small and are not specially fundamental to others; but there are some in which a cessation of work spreads its results immediately to a great part of industrial life. Such industries as coal mining, railway and steamship transportation, and the steel industry are basal to the industrial life itself. Strikes in such industries at once stop, more or less, the whole system of industry; and as the production of wealth of no nation is ever very far ahead of its consumption, untold suffering and loss are involved.

It is for such reasons that so much thought is being given to the problem of the strike. To forbid it by law does not solve the problem; it is well-nigh impossible to carry out such a law; and in any case the condition which underlies the strike is not touched and so remains as a basis of discontent and strife. Arbitration, instead of strikes, in varied forms and with varying power, is being experimented with, with not too great success thus far, largely because of the difficulty of creating confidence in the arbitrating authority. Direct governmental control and management of basal industries is also advocated by some, as the only way to operate satisfactorily industries so vital to the life of society as a whole. It is evident that the solution of this problem goes to the very heart of the industrial conflict and demands the most serious consideration of every citizen. It is not to be settled by prejudice, but by a far more intelligent understanding of the facts involved than is common at the present time.

It is to be noticed that in all the suggestions about the limitation on strikes the demand is from society itself. It is assumed that its interest and right are superior over the interest and right of private property. The substitution of arbitration for strikes — whether wise or not — limits the individual control of industrial property

of both capital and labor for the protection of the welfare of society. So, even more, the possible governmental operation of great industries, if it should come about, will be undertaken in order to safeguard the entire life of society against the private property interests of a few. In other words, all such possible movements or changes imply a recognition that *private property is an institution created by society to serve society.* Changing conditions may make it necessary to change some of the aspects of the institution itself in order to make it fulfill its social function. And if it should cease altogether to perform a social function — that is, to have a value for society — it would cease to have a right and reason for existence.

Relation of class conflict to government and public opinion. The conflict between classes always tends to develop as one aspect the effort to control public opinion and so to strengthen class position and power. As long as slavery or semi-slavery was a recognized class fact, government and public opinion need not and usually did not concern itself with the needs or demands of the slave group. Society was solidly stratified along class lines, so that the passage from class to class was at least difficult and unusual. But with the abolition of slavery and the obtaining of political rights by labor has come a great change in the class struggle. Education, labor-mobility, and the variety and kinds of industrial activity have made the up-and-down movement — the movement from class to class — far easier and more usual. The easily accepted idea that the classes having superior position are superior by nature, and that their opinion should rule, gives way to the belief that men of any class may show ability if given opportunity, and to the suspicion that the opinion of a ruling class is really the outgrowth and expression of its own interests alone. As a consequence the struggle between classes often takes the form of a conflict to control government and the making and expression of public opinion. Fortunately, there is a growing consciousness of the importance and unity of life of the entire society regardless of class. There is a real demand and effort to make government the instrument of the whole community or nation. Here lies one of the most serious questions of social life. The movement toward democracy is at heart a recognition that each society (as a body of people) must be thought of as supreme

over its groups of every kind; that government must serve the life of all the members of society; that government must express public, not class, opinion; that the instruments by which public opinion is developed and made known must be carefully guarded lest they become the servant of class rather than people; and that ultimately the division of society into classes, with different social positions and resting upon difference in property, should end. The ferment and struggle of our age largely center here. Democracy is both an achievement and a hope; much has been gained, class lines are modified, education is far more possible for all men, opportunity is spreading. Yet much remains to be thought out and made real; the problems of citizenship very considerably are the outgrowth of this conflict over property and class, and the struggle to make social organization more nearly democratic in its instruments and character. An educated and intelligent citizenship is the first essential; a citizenship filled with a sense of social obligation is equally fundamental. "*The measure of the worth of a man is his sense of social obligation.*" [1]

Summary. Class conflict and the antagonism over property illustrate clearly the difference between those forms of competitive effort that are stimulative of high-grade achievement and from which society profits, and those conflicts which are purely destructive. The existence of classes and unequal distribution of wealth tear down the social order and weaken the ties which bind society together. Common standards, common ideals, common purposes are undermined and tend to disappear. Social conscience degenerates and social discipline relaxes, with an increase of crime and the possibility of revolution. The only way by which these evils can be avoided and the life and progress of society maintained is by the substitution of coöperation between all members of society, and this implies of necessity that, while there will be various groups within society growing out of differences of occupation and of interest, these will not constitute classes resting upon unjust distribution of wealth and upon inherited and destructive privilege.

[1] Mazzini.

READING REFERENCES

Baker, R. S.: *Following the Color Line.*
Boas, F.: "Problem of the American Negro," in *Yale Review*, January, 1921.
Brawley, B.: *A Social History of the American Negro.*
DuBois, W. E. B.: *Souls of Black Folk.*
DuBois, W. E. B.: *Dark Water.*
Haworth, P. L.: *America in Ferment*, ch. v.
Mecklin, J. M.: *Democracy and Race Friction.*
Report of Committee on Race Relations: *The Negro in Chicago.*
Washington, B. T.: *Up from Slavery.*
Work, M. N.: *The Negro Year Book.*
Wolfe, A. B.: *Readings in Social Problems*, pp. 665–790.

Gulick, G. L.: *The American Japanese Problem.*
Jenks, J. W., and Lauck, W. J.: *The Immigration Problem* (5th ed.), chs. XIII and XV.
Millis, H. A.: *The Japanese Problem.*
Pitkin, W. B.: *Must We Fight Japan?*

Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, chs. XVII to XXVII.
Ely, R. T.: *Property and Contract*, ch. VI.
Hobhouse, L. T., and others: *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, ch. I.
Hobson, J. A.: *Work and Wealth*, ch. XVI.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XVI, and XXIV to XXVII.
Ryan, J. A.: *A Living Wage.*
Sellers, R. W.: *The Next Step in Democracy*, chs. VII and VIII.
Tannenbaum, F.: *The Labor Movement*, ch. IV

QUESTIONS

1. Write a brief sketch of the history of the American negro problem. What strictly race basis is apparent? What phases of conflict-history (traditional beliefs, antipathies, etc.) affect the problem?
2. Is there any difference between what you *know* and what you *believe* in regard to the relative inborn capacities of the black and the white races? What is the basis of your *knowledge?*
3. What facts can you give in regard to the vital statistics of the negro? Can you draw any conclusions from these facts in regard to the future of the negro in America?
4. Are 'backward' peoples necessarily inferior peoples? What other conditions beside heredity determine the present position of any people or race?
5. What is the significance of the recent migration of American negroes from the South to the North? Causes; extent; possible consequences.
6. Why is the division of a people into layers or strata (classes) considered a danger to wholesome social life? Does the difference between classes rest upon race? nationality? law? property? or what?
7. If democracy were thoroughly applied would differences in position de-

pend on differences in opportunity? What is inequality in opportunity and how does it arise?

8. Professor Seager, in his *Introduction to Economics*, section 138, says that the population of the United States may be divided into five classes or strata, each being shut off from opportunities in classes above its own. If this is true what does it suggest about the social value which conflict (competition) is thought to yield?
9. Do nations compete with each other industrially? If so, do they observe the same moral standards as in the competition which they establish for their own *internal* industrial competition?
10. When competition in industry has no 'rules of the game,' does it tend toward the values or the evils of conflict?

CHAPTER XVII

METHODS OF CONFLICT

It remains to consider the main *methods* or *means* of social conflict, and how each reacts upon social welfare.

There are three main methods of conflict: war, business competition, and discussion. Of these three, war is the principal resort in national conflicts, though nations also use economic competition; and war is used in race conflicts if races are organized as nations. Competition is employed in the conflict between races and the conflict between classes unless the class conflict at times becomes so intense as to lead to a class war. Discussion in its manifold forms is used by all conflicting groups, but has gradually been expanded and organized until it has become clear to thoughtful men that it may ultimately be substituted for war and for the destructive varieties of economic competition.

Of these three methods, war tends to be largely destructive, not only of the conqueror, but also the conquered; competition is at times destructive, but also may be stimulative of constructive thought and valuable economic discovery; discussion sometimes is wasteful of effort, but ordinarily brings minds into contact and stimulates inventiveness, develops intelligence, and builds finer civilization. Discussion is the ultimate method of progress; its wise and intelligent organization is fundamental to social welfare.

I. War

Early war. War as a method of conflict is very old. It came into existence with the growth of surplus wealth, but it expressed also the sentiments, both good and bad, of the tribes or cities or nations which relied on war. It is necessary to recognize that aggressive war has always looked toward conquest, which stands for the enrichment of the conqueror at the expense of the conquered. Wealth in the form of captives, cattle, land, or other desirable goods was always sought. It was thus a method of gaining property, but not by production. In addition, it let loose the passions of men, per-

mitting them to express their hate, their lust, their cruelty, their delight in destruction. Instinctive pugnacity is a factor, but it is in no way adequate to explain the institution of war; and the history of past war, the memories built into the minds of a people, become further incentives to conflict.

The immediate effect of war upon the societies using it is so to react upon their social life as to militarize their peace-time system of life. Those who are in control in a society find their control far stronger if they have a military system. Military life disciplines men by force. It is impatient of difference of ideas and is intolerant. It thus makes the organized life of its people rigid, set, and unprogressive, in spite of the fact that conquest may have yielded wealth.

Why modern war does not lead to progress. Many early societies made war as regularly as they engaged in business. Those who ruled them expected to make profit thereby, much as merchants make profit in trade. The matter of special significance is that war was waged by whatever group was the real organizing unit of social life. If men were organized for ordinary life by tribes, then war was waged by tribes; if the social unit was a city, as in the days of the mediæval republics, the city was also the war unit of society. And where social life was organized by national states, there war also was carried on by nations. It is well to recognize this fact if we are to appreciate the destructiveness of modern warfare. War has always been destructive, but never so hopelessly so as to-day. As long as economic-social life was organized by small units or by nations, war might bring wealth from one nation to another. But it is a commonplace to-day that nations are not at all separate economic units; capital pays less and less attention to national boundaries; English, French, German, and American capitalists have investments all over the world; business is organized without reference to national limits; trade is a world system; and, most important of all, the financial basis of the economic life of the world is international, not national. Thus a war between nations to-day has relatively little chance to bring economic advantage from one nation to the other; but instead it tends to be destructive of the economic welfare of all who engage in it.

The history of the world is a repetition of the continued round of war, conquest, exhaustion, and degeneration, sometimes rapid and occasionally delayed by favoring conditions. The rise and fall of nations is largely this story; the only hope of steady progress lies in the abolition of war as a method of conflict.

The character of this method of conflict will appear most clearly from a brief study of some facts of the last Great War.

Illustrations from the Great War. The immediate economic loss is impossible to imagine. It is estimated by Irwin that the war cost directly $186,000,000,000. If the indirect cost in "destruction of property, loss of production, and the capitalized value of human lives" be added to the direct cost, it brings the total to $337,000,000,000. The direct war cost — aside from destruction of property and lives — of a single day in the last year of the war was $240,000,000. In 1920, "with the war over and done," the United States was "spending ninety-three per cent of its national revenues on wars, old and new." [1]

Of greater moment than any economic loss is the loss of life and the untold suffering which accompanied it. Danish statisticians have estimated that "ten million soldiers in arms died in the war, in battles or of wounds; and two to three million soldiers were permanently disabled." In addition, "thirty million others (civilians) who might be living to-day are dead." [2] Once more the imagination of man fails utterly, even faintly, to picture or suggest the meaning of these terrible figures. Speaking of the estimated thirty million civilians who were destroyed, Irwin says, "most of them died *just because they were in the way of war* — died of malnutrition in blockaded countries, of starvation and exposure in the great treks away from the invading armies." These were children, women, and the aged, as well as men, left to work while soldiers fought — three times the actual number of soldiers killed; and the lowering of living standards and conditions continues and will continue for years to come, involving a reduction of births and an increase of sickness and suffering.

To this must be added the reminder that the ten million soldiers were picked men in the period of life which governs the birth rate.

[1] Irwin, *The Next War*, pp. 83 and 95. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 50 and 65.

From those ten million picked men there are few successors to carry on their hereditary qualities. It is not possible to measure the effect upon the hereditary quality of the world's population, of thus at a stroke destroying so great a part of its strongest men. But it requires no great knowledge of biology to recognize how utterly antagonistic this must be to the ultimate building of a finer and more vigorous race.

Still another form of destruction has resulted from the war, a destruction which war always brings. This is not so easily seen, yet is a vital aspect. This war not only destroyed things and people; it weakened social organization. Society is more than material goods and a given number of people; it is an organized system of relations and ideas. The organization of society is a mental fact; it is an order and a belief in that order. Authority, law, beliefs, understandings, standards of conduct, confidence and trust in fellow-men — these, built together through tradition and reasoning, underlie and are the basis of society. The possibility of a financial system rests upon confidence or trust; and even more the daily life of mankind together in all the manifold contacts and undertakings are embedded in a more or less accepted and powerful system of understandings and ideals. Society is thus a real unity in mind and faith through which it becomes possible for men to live together and so to live at all. And this it is which the war has seriously weakened. The overthrow of the confidence of man in man prevents a financial reorganization of the world, just as the destruction of belief in the goodness, the justness, the trustworthiness, even the decency of fellow-men, builds such barriers of exclusion, of anger, and of hatred as to make difficult if not impossible the organization of society itself.

Finally, the Great War made clear another feature of destruction. First, it is evident that war turns all the constructive mind of the peoples involved into channels of destruction. Men of science turned their entire thought toward the making of means to tear down the social structure which it has taken years to build. In addition to this, it also is plain that war has come to be a conflict, not between armies merely, but between peoples. Strength depended upon the control of civilian populations, and destruction came

heaviest upon civilians. In other words, while earlier wars have been, largely at least, fought by and controlled by armies, wars now have escaped control by armies, and have come to be conflicts in which entire peoples — men, women, and children — battle with each other and destroy each other. What this may mean in the way not only of destruction of men and wealth, but of the structure of the bonds of society itself is difficult to realize.

Summary. The way out of destructive conflict is through new methods of coöperation. The war conflict between nations must follow this road. Habits of action and of thought and feeling are the outgrowth of organized group life. If nations can agree to make an international political organization, through which conflicts may and must be settled, in time the habit of using this organization will become established; international customs, international institutions, will grow, and wider sentiments and feelings will respond. Out of group action come group customs and individual habits of mind and behavior. National institutions, centered in a common government and common customs, are the basis of national sentiments and the national mind; in the same way an international organization with at least the beginnings of international government, together with an already existing common international economic life and moral standards, will build international ways of thinking and feeling — an international mind. The necessary first step is the building of an international political organization, whose function is to direct and control those varied interests of mankind which reach beyond nations and which, therefore, lead nations into conflict.

II. Economic Competition

The term 'competition' is used in two senses. In the more general sense the entire struggle which is continually taking place in nature is of the competitive type and is so called; in the human world this struggle is found, as well as in the plant and animal world. It shows itself in the fact of survival of varieties and also in the success of ideas. It is in the human world a method of measurement or grading and of placement, roughly determining the position, the work, the activity of men.

The second sense in which the term is used is that of economic competition. This is a more restricted use, both because it has to do with only a single field of activity, and also because economic competition is *limited and controlled by the varied ideas and arrangements which each society has worked out* in connection with its group effort both to live and to determine the channels of its industrial activities.

It is in the sense of economic competition that the term is here used.

In the production of wealth competition is a universal fact and method. It is a struggle of individual against individual, and of group against group. Sellers of goods are arrayed against buyers, consumers against producers. Moreover, within the production process the different factors compete, laborers against capitalists, and each of these against landowners; and within each of these groups further competition takes place, laborer against laborer, employer against employer, landowner against landowner.

Monopoly and competition. It will be noticed, however, that while the tendency to compete is universal, there is at work a counter-tendency to unite. This is observable in reference to those groups whose economic interests are most nearly alike; laborers unite with laborers, and capitalists with capitalists, while landowners also work together in the struggle against other groups. This tendency to unite in the economic struggle those groups whose economic interests are alike brings about a division into economic classes, and at times these economic classes become social classes.

The economic value of competition as a method of conflict is of two sorts. First, it stimulates economy in production and improvement in the methods of production; and, second, it tends to regulate or control the price of goods in exchange. In so far as these results are brought about, society gains by the process. But competition in industry is constantly being limited. Those in similar economic position are likely to agree with each other in order to be able to charge a higher price for their goods. Certain natural conditions may also aid them in this process of limitation of competition. These efforts to limit competition may have to do with selling or with buying. If they have to do with selling, the hope is to elimi-

nate or reduce competition between sellers in order to raise the price of goods. This is accomplished through having a single selling agency take the place of many, and constitutes what is called a monopoly. If monopoly is made possible through conditions of nature or the technical organization of industry, the effort to compete under such circumstances is wasteful and to be avoided in the interest of society. Examples are railways, telegraph, telephone, city public utilities, the postal system. In such cases competition is an example of destructive conflict, wasting and destroying the productive wealth of society, since a single system can supply the needs of society as well as many; thus the capital invested in duplicate systems is wasted. In such cases the problem presented to society is not to prevent monopoly, but to find a method of controlling prices. The holders of a monopoly have a great power over the remainder of society through their control over prices, particularly if the monopoly goods be necessary and important to life.

Society, therefore, in its own interest and for the sake of its own welfare, may and often does limit private property or control of monopoly goods. It may do it by various forms of regulation of price or by direct public ownership, both of which methods are being tried in different places and in regard to different monopoly goods. Which method is the better is a chief problem in economics and politics.

A different kind of monopoly is often brought into existence by varieties of agreement simply leading to a limitation of production. Under such circumstances, a single selling organization serves the interest only of the producers who make the monopoly, and at the expense of larger production and lower prices to consumers. The temptation to do this is great, and where some scarcity of material or resource (as anthracite coal) is involved, or some special position due to legislation (such as the tariff or patent laws), it becomes possible to organize monopolies successfully at least for a time. Corners, price agreements, and trusts are illustrative of this movement to eliminate competition. In such cases public policy must be determined by weighing the advantages gained by large-scale or centralized administration against the disadvantages occasioned by the loss of inventiveness and interstimulation involved in competi-

tion as well as through the power which comes to monopolists through the control of prices.

The aim of society in regard to combinations and the regulation of competition should be to preserve the stimulative quality found in competition while guarding against the individual control over wealth and life and power which private monopoly gives. 'Unfair' competition is competition which destroys the rival, but does not do so by superior methods in production or organization. Therefore, society gains nothing, but loses the stimulation to effort. So, too, combination results in losing the stimulative value of competition, but it is quite possible that other advantages found in superior organizations on a larger scale may offset this loss. The danger here is the power which thus is given to individuals over other men's lives.

Limitation of competition by consumers is also effected. Just as a trade union lessens competition in the selling of labor, so a manufacturers' association limits competition in the buying of labor. All forms of consumers' coöperation are organized in the interest of the limitation of competition between consumers. This movement has assumed great proportions in England and on the Continent of Europe.

Possible modification of evils of competition. In industry the competitive struggle may be wrongly directed or organized. Competition between employers and employees often becomes a purely destructive conflict involving waste of wealth and overthrow of productive power. The recognized inefficiency in the organization of capital and the similar lack of productive power of labor seem largely to be the result of a type of conflict between these two factors of production which has given rise to hatreds and violence closely resembling the evil accompaniments of war as a method of conflict. Here the only sane social policy lies in bringing these two factors of production into conscious coöperative control of industries instead of competitive and individual control.[1]

III. Discussion

The third method of conflict is discussion. Here the conflict is

[1] See discussion in Commons: *Industrial Good Will.*

one of ideas and not of arms. The values to society which arise out of conflict lie in the contact of minds and their stimulation one of another. Through mental contact comes invention and discovery, new knowledge both of nature and of human relationships. Discussion is the substitution of mental contact for physical combat; through the contacts of mind which it makes possible may come primarily a better understanding of the problems of social life. Prejudice may yield to intelligence and the evils of destruction be lessened or eliminated.

This is not to say that discussion always brings conflict to an end, but it provides ways by which differences may be solved, leading to compromise between opposing demands. It is, also, often true that discussion proves to be a path from conflict to coöperation. The art of social organization is a difficult one; and much of conflict is really stupid, but is backed by prejudice and custom, so that the habits of action are of the conflict type. Discussion has often been the means of bringing to light better methods and plans of organization resting on coöperation of the very groups which had previously been in conflict. The Constitution of the United States is a substitution of a form of federal coöperation for the antagonisms of thirteen more or less opposing States. Discussion of the representatives of these States brought it about that compromises, toleration, and final coöperation took the place of conflict.

The organized use of discussion. Discussion has come to be organized and uses different agencies. In political life it is organized in deliberative assemblies, which have so largely displaced war as a method of conflict between parties or sects within a nation. Elections also rest upon the use of discussion instead of force, and the possibilities of democratic government depend upon the growth of the habit of trusting to discussion expressing itself in voting, instead of warfare between parties or groups which stand for difference of idea or interest.

Conflict in religion has largely been modified through the use of discussion. So education uses discussion as its method of adjustment of differences. Local communities, too, find it possible to reach common understanding and action through the use of community assemblies for discussion.

In industry discussion has not advanced so far as in political life, and much of industrial progress waits for the adoption of rational discussion methods. Most strikes need not occur if there were regular sessions of established deliberative organizations representative of the conflicting interests of employers and employees. Such deliberative groups — representative committees rather than large bodies of men — are now at work in a few industries, such as the clothing industry, and the results give promise of greatly modifying the conflicts in these industries. Too commonly it is true in industry, however, that the contending and opposing forces are like two armed camps, each using methods not far removed from those of open warfare between nations.

The agencies or instruments of discussion are such arrangements as deliberative assemblies, judicial courts, public platforms, and the press in all its forms. When it is remembered that these also are, aside from the schools, the chief instruments of education, it is seen that discussion as a means of conflict aims at persuasion, and that *education aims to give a basis for judgment in reacting to the arts of persuasion.* Persuading people is not educating them, but real education develops the judgment so that men enter into discussion intelligently and not foolishly or ignorantly. If discussion is to become, more and more (and this is to be hoped) the great instrument of conflict, it is essential that men be educated, since its intelligent use depends upon education.

READING REFERENCES

Angell, Norman: *The Great Illusion.*
Bagehot, W.: *Physics and Politics.*
Bogart, E. L.: *Direct and Indirect Costs of the Great War.*
Clark, J. M., Hamilton, W. H., and Moulton, H. G.: *Readings in the Economics of War*, Part XIII.
Dewey, J., and Tufts, J. H.: *Ethics*, chs. XXIII to XXV.
Duggan, S. P.: *The League of Nations.*
Folks, H.: *Human Costs of the War.*
Irwin, W. H.: *Christ or Mars.*
Irwin, W. H.: *The Next War.*
James, W.: "A Moral Equivalent for War," in *Memoirs and Studies.*
Johnson, A.: "War and Labor," in *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1914.
Jones, E.: *Trust Problems in the United States.*
Jordan, D. S.: *The Blood of the Nation.*
Jordan, D. S.: *War and Waste.*

Kellogg, V.: *Beyond War*, ch. VI.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XXI and XXII.

QUESTIONS

1. Government by discussion "inhibits ill-considered action. It gives passion time to cool, it makes for moderation and for poise." (Giddings: *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, p. 222). How does this characterization suggest the superiority of discussion over war as a method of conflict?
2. Is the mutual destruction which constitutes the first evil in conflict as characteristic of discussion as of war? (Compare a given war with some known discussion.)
3. Does war share in the value of conflict in that it stimulates to greater achievement? If so, in what direction or fields is its stimulation found — in socially constructive inventions or the opposite? Find illustrations from the Great War.
4. Find facts which will throw light upon the relation of war to the birth-rate, and to the hereditary quality of the people. (Read Jordan: *War and the Breed;* or Popenoe and Johnson: *Applied Eugenics*, ch. 16.)

CHAPTER XVIII

COÖPERATION

In describing conflict, its chief varieties and its methods, frequent reference has been made to coöperation. Coöperation is a fundamental social process. Just as conflict is going on constantly and is the basis of much of the life of society, so coöperation takes place and always has from the beginning of life. A large part of history is the account of the discovery and organizing of new and suitable methods of coöperation. And just as conflict is found in relation to all the fundamental interests of mankind — in politics, industry, religion, and others — so coöperations exist in regard to all of these interests. The ultimate art of social life is to organize so that men coöperate in every field of endeavor, yet are so organized as to permit such conflict as is valuable as a spur to invention and the putting forth of vigorous effort. Those who object to all conflict and competition fail to recognize the spur which conflict often gives to effort; while those who object to coöperation do not realize the social destruction involved in most kinds and methods of conflict.

Why coöperation takes place. Coöperation is natural to man, in the sense that it rests upon inborn tendencies or instincts. The social instincts bring people together, as in play. Desire for and delight in companionship goes back to this instinctive basis. Sympathy is the great emotional basis of coöperation; affection and love, as of parents and children, is the root of the division of labor within the family coöperative unit. Sacrifice of one for another is natural, through sympathy; and by sacrifice, coöperation often is made conscious and effective.

Yet coöperation is not chiefly an instinctive or emotional reaction of man to man. In the main it is the result of thinking. It has made progress only as men have come to understand the possibilities of collective action, and is therefore really a result of the appeal to reason as against the emotional hatreds and prejudices of conflict. The real nature of coöperation lies in the statement that

significant coöperations have usually been the result of deliberate planning and have followed a recognition of the evils of destructive conflict.

It is thus to be clearly understood that it is not true that destructive conflict is inevitable in 'the nature of things' while coöperation is "a sentimental and artificial effort which is bound to fail because it does not recognize that conflict is natural." Conflict is, indeed, natural and so is coöperation; both have their emotional aspect also; but coöperation normally supersedes conflict because it is found to be more rational and to serve human welfare better.

Types and aims of coöperation. Coöperation may be merely technical or it may be conscious and purposive. The highest values of coöperation are found in the latter case. By technical coöperation is meant such a relationship of parts in an organization that each is essential to its work. Division of labor in industry illustrates this kind of coöperation; in the factory, each worker is needed and each machine, as well as the directive element. There is here a technical coöperation, yet the factory may be a scene of intense and bitter conflict. If, however, employer and employee build a common organization for the adjustment of difficulties arising through conditions of work, wages, or other aspects of the organization, conscious coöperation takes the place of destructive conflict. An element of conflict may remain, but its destructive quality is largely or entirely eliminated through the adoption of a new principle of action. Coöperation means working together, while conflict means clashing with each other.

The aim in coöperation is distinctly different from that in conflict. Coöperation is group organization for mutual benefit and for common good. The aim in conflict is in the majority of cases the advantage of a ruling or controlling class, which is made possible through the subordination and use of others. Coöperation thus looks toward equal rights and the respect for the life of all, while conflict for domination assumes inequality and the superior right of those who hold power. Coöperation is made possible through mutual understanding, leadership which represents and standards which are built by the entire group. Conflict for dominance exists

by force, through organization and leadership from above, and obedience and discipline exacted from those dominated.[1]

Graham Wallas [2] has pointed out and discussed the three great fields of coöperative organization. These are the organization of effort, of will, and of thought. The organization of effort has as its purpose to bring about unified action under a single directing idea or leader. An orchestra following a leader, an army obeying a commander, a factory unified under a manager, are illustrations of this widespread type of coöperation. On the contrary, a political election is an organization of will; so also is a lawmaking assembly, and similar efforts to find and express the common will or purpose. Coöperation in thought is found wherever men unite in the discovery of truth or the spread of real knowledge. A university, a research bureau, or an encyclopædia are illustrations. It is, of course, plain that many organizations express more than one — perhaps all three — of these varieties of coöperation.

A difficulty which has often been found in coöperation is that of finding leaders. Every organization needs leadership; coöperative organization needs it as much as organization of the conflict-domination type. Two aspects of this difficulty may be noted. The unwillingness of mutual coöperators to select and support efficient leaders is at times a real problem. But this may wisely be recognized as a difficulty which greater experience in coöperation is already beginning to overcome; in politics it is not clear that imperial governments to-day choose more capable leaders than do democratic governments; in industry the same progress may soon be found and is even now true in important cases. The growing education of all mankind, instead of education of a ruling class only, is an important phase of this change and will more and more affect it.

It has been doubted also whether able leaders will be found who are willing to serve society unless they receive the reward of the individual control of power in their own right. This argument no longer needs consideration in such fields as politics, religion, education, or scientific research. In these and other fields of life, men

[1] See J. H. Tufts: *Ethics of Coöperation.*
[2] Graham Wallas: *The Great Society*, part II.

of ability have been willing and eager to lead coöperative enterprises for mutual service; and there seems to be no good ground to doubt that in business, both manufacturing and commercial, the approval of fellow-men, the love of constructive activity, and the sheer desire to serve, will prove adequate incentives to bring able leaders into coöperative business enterprises. Indeed, the delight of adventure and discovery through experiment in making new arrangements and relations between men lies here rather than in the older domination type of organization.

Methods and units of coöperation. To make coöperation the leading principle in social organization, each social group needs its organized agencies of coöperation. For example, social settlements may be considered as one of the instruments or agencies of coöperation of the neighborhood life. The purpose of the settlement is the enrichment of neighborhood life, "so that the people shall know and care for one another"; through it there may grow a mutual understanding which is the basis of coöperation. City neighborhoods gather together people of different classes, nations, and races. 'Settlements' are at least one of the agencies where all may meet and engage in common and mutual activities.

Entire communities may and should organize their coöperative agencies in order to develop a consciousness of their common life together and their mutual interests. Community places of meeting for education and recreation are essential to the best community spirit. Discussion of community interests there takes place and a loyalty to community welfare grows. The same valuable result tends to follow community administration of its education, its recreation, its health interests, its public utilities, and its housing needs. *Uniting in activities builds the habit of working together and the consciousness of unity of interest.*

It may be added that conflict organization and coöperative organization each breeds its own type of leaders. Where conflict between nations is dominant, leaders who believe in conflict and who are skilled in its methods rise to the top. On the other hand, where coöperation is undertaken, leaders whose ability and purpose look toward bringing about efficient and willing mutual action are brought to light. The labor movement illustrates this fact. Where

labor unions have been opposed to capitalist employers, each like an armed camp, a conflict type of leadership has been developed — men skilled in opposition and in the tactics and strategy of conflict. But where labor and capital have tried some form of coöperation, as in the clothing trades, a new type of leader has been needed and has come to light, leaders who can bring men together, who can harmonize, who can find ways of developing an interest in creative effort and in service.

Coöperation a continuous process. Coöperation is never complete nor final. Inside the coöperating group arrangements are experimental, and individuals exist who prefer domination to mutual service. Outside the coöperating group there are other groups which may compete with it and force it in spite of itself to be a conflict organization. The reaction upon the inner organization is then toward a conflict aim and a conflict system. The failure of coöperation is usually the fact that it is never inclusive enough. A family coöperates within itself, but not with other families to make a good neighborhood; a class coöperates with its members, but will not unite with others in the building of community welfare; a nation becomes for many purposes a coöperative unit, but insists upon conflict with other nations. And yet the closer and closer interrelationships of life which are characteristic of our age make it clear that the danger to every coöperative plan lies at the point where it begins to build barriers of conflict and antagonism about itself. Always the reaction of conflict is to the destruction of the possibility of real coöperation within. The conflict methods of domination used by one race against another react in violence to the destruction of the welfare of the dominating race. Hostility and war of one nation against another makes for hatred and revolution within each nation. The hope of the future, therefore, looks toward a better understanding of the way in which all life is linked together, and the effort to make coöperation as wide and inclusive as mankind itself.

Conflict and coöperation thus stand in opposition as contradictory processes in society. The value of conflict is found in the stimulation which results from the placing of men in opposition. The overwhelming tendency of conflict is to become simply destructive

of the welfare of society. Conflict looks toward domination and exploitation: it destroys freedom and establishes slavery; while cooperation aims at mutual service: it is founded upon equality and leads to freedom.

Struggle and effort are thus a necessary and inevitable and valuable fact in social life. But struggle may be either antagonistic (conflict) or coöperative. The possibility of the substitution of coöperative effort for antagonistic-conflict effort constitutes the hope of social progress.

SUMMARY OF PART II

1. Men live in groups.
2. They develop settled group-ways of thinking, feeling, and acting; these constitute social relations.
3. These group-ways (customs, folk-ways, standards) exist between individuals within the group and between sub-groups.
4. They all have to do with more or less vital interests of life, growing out of deepseated, inborn impulses and tendencies.
5. They are more or less permanent, and at a given time and place they make the system or order of society, and both limit and enlarge the opportunity and life of the individual and the subordinate group.
6. The order of society is fundamental: there can be no life without it. To understand a people or an age is to understand its system or order.
7. Though group-ways and the social order are relatively permanent, they are never entirely so; rather are they always subject to change and modification, either through slow and imperceptible adjustment or through open conflict, either violent (revolution) or based upon education, discussion, and cooperation.

READING REFERENCES

Drummond, H.: *The Ascent of Man*, ch. VII.
Giddings: *Elements of Sociology*, ch. VII.
Kropotkin, P.: *Mutual Aid.*
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XIX to XXII.
Tufts, J. H.: *Coöperation.*

Tufts, J. H.: *Real Business of Living*, chs. 10–14.
Wallas, G.: *The Great Society.* (For mature students this work will repay careful study.)
Watkins, G. S.: *Introduction to Study of Labor Problems*, chs. XVIII and XIX.

QUESTIONS

1. Give examples of coöperation which seems to rest on spontaneous sympathy; of coöperation which reveals reflective planning.
2. Give examples of coöperations whose purpose is to increase production; to decide what a group wants; to stimulate discovery. How do these three varieties differ?
3. Has any phase of your formal education been of value with reference to the art of coöperation?
4. "The function of struggle [conflict] is to work out new forms of coöperation." Study the great conflicts in American history to see if this principle is illustrated. What line of action does this suggest as suitable in regard to the typical conflicts of the present?
5. Discuss the question, Should arbitration take the place of strikes in industrial conflict? What other coöperative measures in the organizing of industry may have value in preventing industrial conflict?
6. What types of coöperation are of greatest social value?
7. It is said that there are "two main bases of progress; one is the discovery of nature, the other the discovery of new forms of coöperation." Why are *new* forms necessary?
8. Explain the statement, "The practice of mutual aid socializes character." Find illustrations.

CHAPTER XX

POPULATION AND THE FAMILY

POPULATION is the basis of every society; but populations do not of themselves make societies. The organization of populations largely determines their size and general characteristics. Organization is brought about by a mass of customs, standards, and laws, which, taken together, constitute the *institution of the family*. It is the family through which the ideas of a society most directly become expressed in its population.

Family function and historical backgrounds. Sex instinct is the basis of the continuance of population, but all peoples have established ways or customs through which this instinct is controlled in the interest of social welfare. Nature thus provides for the continuance of the human stock, but does so through blind instinct only. It is society through the family which has devised and ordered those standards and regulations which largely direct and control the instincts implanted by nature. The reason why societies have exercised such control is largely because of the desire for a particular size and kind of population. It has been dimly seen that the continuance of population is not only a question of the birth of children, but of their remaining alive and of their future behavior. The family embodies as an institution these ideas and standards of society, and has therefore as its *function both the birth and the physical and mental preservation and development of children.*

The family as an institution has always taken its characteristics from the society of which it is a part. Among early peoples, whose numbers were small and whose social order was simple, the family was likely to carry out its functions through the fact that it was an economic, an educational, and a religious unit of social life. The beginning of the family life through marriage, its break by divorce or desertion or death, the division of labor, the control of property, the exercise of authority and discipline, the carrying on of worship, and the determination of kinship, were all important aspects of the

early family life and system. The study of early family customs is an interesting though very intricate one; it makes evident how vital to the development of every civilization this institution has been and still is. It is impossible, however, in a book of this kind to enter upon a discussion of these historical backgrounds. It must suffice to say that all the European peoples for centuries past, as well as many other societies, have had the family form known as 'patriarchal,' by which is meant primarily that authority resided in the father. In pastoral and agricultural life this type of family organization flourished. The immediate family of parents and children as well as those near of kin, and the slaves and servants also, were under the authority of the paternal head. He was the performer of religious worship, the controller of the economic life, the holder of property, the disciplinary authority, the representative of the family in law and government. Giddings describes this family system as religious-proprietary, signifying that its essential characteristics were the carrying on of religion (and morals) and the control and disposal of property. Though usage varied from place to place, the position of both mother and children was usually secondary to that of the father.

It is upon this background that modern family problems arise. Changes of many kinds have come about, due in part to changes in economic life and in part to new knowledge and the tendency to individualize mankind; that is, to consider and treat each person as an individual, even though his membership in an institution is recognized at the same time. Such changes show themselves primarily in the modification of the position of women and of children in the direction both of freedom and equality. It is necessary to remember, however, that for ages of time the family has been the primary unit-group of society. Through it was brought to childhood the knowledge, the ideals, the social environment of purposes and standards of the community. Ignorant and oppressive and unjust as it often was, in its better expression it has been the initial builder or transmitter of the virtues by which society exists. And in spite of many changes the family is still the institution through which the relation of the sexes is brought under the control of responsibility to society and through which children receive such

protection, physical, mental, and moral, as society is intelligent enough to demand and afford.

The modern family and its problems. Much of the work of the older family has now become the function of other institutions. The school, early in the child's life, assumes the formal task of education; the State through government exercises authority and limits the control of parents; religion is organized in the Church, and in so far as religion influences the modern family it does so by means of the activities of the Church, at least in large degree. In spite of these modifications in the function and work of the family, it remains one of the most vital and necessary institutions of social life.

Social values of normal family life. The home is the expression of the unity of the family. At its foundation there has been an economic unity, and with this there has been a unity in feeling, in sentiment, and in ideas and standards. Unity in life refers to the fact that the individual is so closely bound with others that the expression of his individual wishes is to some extent subordinated to, or at least modified by, the interests and wishes of the group-unit. Through this fact the discipline of the individual is brought about; he comes to understand that life is not single or individual, but that the wills of men work to best effect if they work in harmony. Thus there is embedded in him such sentiments as those of fair play, truth, kindness, helpfulness, self-sacrifice, which are the basis of the possibility of wholesome social life. The development of his knowledge, too, is dependent, in his early life, upon those contacts which are made in the home. Thus the family home is the beginner of intellectual and moral education.

Moreover, the home is the protector of childhood. Without the care of children by the home as expressed primarily in the love of the mother, there would be little possibility of children growing to maturity. It is through and by the home that children are fed, clothed, housed, and guarded against or healed from accident and sickness. Child life is organized and sustained within the home; the home-world is its chief social environment, reflecting, indeed, the social life of the larger community, yet the child's immediate circle of influence is at first found in the home itself.

It is hardly necessary thus to describe and emphasize the social

value of the family. It is recognized by all thinkers as well as by the great mass of humanity as it reflects upon its own experience. Let us simply say in a word that the family is the basis of child protection and is the transmitter to childhood of those ages of experience in living — both of knowledge and ideals — which make up the vital social heritage of each society. Nevertheless, it is evident that this description applies to the normal family, expressing the life and standards of the better part of society. Far too often families are not normal and fail as protectors of child life. In view of this fact there are two possibilities before society; one is to abandon family life and substitute some other way of guarding and educating children; the other is to protect and improve the family so that it may better perform its valuable social functions.

The first of those alternatives is a vague suggestion the practical possibilities of which are untried and the evils of which are probably insurmountable. While occasional social thinkers have talked of the regulation of the life of the sexes and the rearing of children by some other means than the family, the plans seem to imply the sacrifice of all the better elements at the foundation of society. It is enough, probably, to say simply that never has any society, except perhaps in isolated places and temporarily, even considered the abolition of the family.

The second suggestion proposes the real problem which society has to face. Granting the supremely important function of the family, the welfare of society is vitally interested in making the family as efficient as possible in the performance of its function. What, therefore, are the conditions which weaken the modern family?

Modern conditions which react upon family values. Industry. The most serious consideration is the *sweeping change in the economic life of modern times* which reflects itself in the organization and social life of the family. In its origin and until recent times, the family was an economic unit, by which is meant that members of the family worked together as a single producer of economic goods, and lived together as a single consumer of those or similar goods. It was, therefore, a coöperating economic unit. In the simplest form it produced practically all it consumed; and while, except in isolated pioneering outposts of our world, this stage of family in-

dustry has long since been modified by exchange, still all agricultural life has been and is to a high degree a family economic activity. All members of this family were producers together in a common enterprise, and the consumption of wealth was a sharing of the common goods so produced. The family home as a place of mutual shelter, the common table, the mutually related tasks, were the usual basis of the mutual family social life, with its memories and sentiments of affection. Though the coöperation was too often forced by the authority of the father, and did not, therefore, always express willing effort, nevertheless, the common economic life had much to do with developing the moral virtues of the members of the family.

The industrial life of our day is rapidly changing this economic family unity, at least in considerable degree and for a large part of our populations. Economic organization to-day uses people as individuals; father, mother, and children may work in quite separate places and in quite different types of industry. The work of one is not even remotely related to that of another; and there remains only such economic unity as is found in a common consumption of the wealth produced by one or more of the separate members of the family working separately. Even this degree of unity is often lacking, the family table giving place to the downtown lunch or the tin-pail lunch as the case may be, with children fed in varying isolated ways. The home too often is nothing more than a common roof and a place for sleep, the unity of work, of play, and of worship having disappeared.

The inevitable effect of this lessening of family economic unity is a tendency to weaken the family social ties of sympathy, affection, and mutual helpfulness, while the individual member thinks of his life in terms of his relation to other groups as often and as vigorously as in relation to the family. There results, therefore, a weakening of family authority and influence, seen in too many families in the self-willed conduct of children as well as of elders. Fortunately these conditions are true only in degree, while the bonds of family affection and helpfulness remain in the majority of cases.

Labor mobility a factor. A second aspect of the change in economic life which affects the family is the intense mobility of labor.

The labor market is a shifting one. Seasons of labor activity are followed by periods of inactivity. Many employments are temporary or casual, demanding labor to-day and discharging it to-morrow; while at occasional intervals occur long stretches of relative unemployment through the widespread shutting-down of manufacturing. In consequence of these shifting conditions of labor demand, a considerable proportion of those who work are continually going in search of employment from place to place, having no locality to which they are attached or community of which they are a part. The result is, first, the separation of fathers from their families, and, second, the rapidly growing fact that families do not own their homes. The first is an important cause of desertion, divorce, and vice, while the second is of equally great social significance through the loss to society of the results of the incentive toward home-ownership. On the whole, the family-owned home is one of the best socializing forces of any society. Its effect upon steadiness, determination, self-sacrifice, and efficient workmanship is marked. Regardless of other considerations, the ownership of the family home deserves the highest encouragement of society. Yet to-day it is rare to find a large city in which as many as twenty-five per cent of its families own the homes they live in; from seventy-five to ninety per cent of the families in large cities are renters.

Bad housing. A further aspect of the change in present industrial life in its relation to the family is the gathering of masses of people in congested city districts, with the inevitable building of crowded and unsuitable tenements without opportunity for privacy or recreation, often unsanitary and unsafe. Here it is easy for the values of home life to disappear and for a promiscuous and degenerate hive life to take its place. In a more well-to-do city quarter the many-storied apartment-house takes the place of the tenement, but reproduces many of its moral evils, while childhood is noted, not, as in a tenement, by its lack of care, but by its relative absence.

The employment of women and children. Modern industry, moreover, has brought into existence many kinds of employment for women and children. The eagerness of each of these to earn for themselves or to add to the meager family wages, takes mothers

away from the homes where their care is needed; it takes the boys and the girls of the family into industry at too young an age and into conditions where the protection of the family, though needed, is impossible. In this way the value of the family as a protective agency for childhood is weakened.

New social contacts. Parallel with the effect of economic changes upon family unity may be noted the way in which the forms of modern communication and activities touch and influence the members of the family as individuals for good or ill. Five days in the week children are brought into the associations of the school. Neighborhood or community recreation takes hold of both children and adults without much regard for the family as a unit. The street, with its restless, changing life, touches individual life and draws it into varied associations. Clubs, gangs, associations of every sort, are everywhere powerful factors of suggestion in individual lives. The press feeds news primarily to individuals, not families. More and more government and law go directly to individuals and recognize individuals.

Thus, with the development of means of communication and new industrial activities has come the growing individualizing of life, with its values of individual freedom, but its dangers to the conserving influence of family life.

Enough has been said to suggest the way in which the changes in modern industry have weakened the economic unity of the family, and to suggest some of the social consequences. Stated in another way, it may be said that the weaknesses of the family as a social institution are found in the *prevalence of sickness, the lack of income, ignorance, bad housing*, and *low moral standards*. The causes of these factors of failure are in part economic and in part social. Their effect is seen in a heavy child death rate, in poverty, in juvenile crime, and in an increase of vice and prostitution. These are conditions which strike at the heart of social welfare. They suggest that society must guard the family from the influences which weaken it. Since these are largely economic and educational, the way toward improvement lies in the establishment by society of more adequate agencies and means of education and in limiting and controlling economic activity wherever it tends to

weaken or harm the family. It is the business of the community to establish standards for its own welfare; its institution of the family is unable to protect itself against the forces of economic profit-making.

The strength of the people. The characteristics of a population depend upon society itself as expressed in its intelligence, its standards, and its organization. Questions which naturally suggest themselves are: What is the proper size of population? Is physical vigor important, and, if so, how is it to be attained? What is the population level of intelligence, and what the efficiency of the instruments of education? Is family income adequate to make possible the conditions of physical vigor and educated intelligence? If not, what stands in the way, and can it be removed? Are qualities of moral character of importance in determining the strength of a people?

Problems of population quality. Such questions emphasize the importance of the qualities of a people, and qualities of both body and mind are the reflex of the kind of a society we have. Nations have usually laid stress upon the wisdom of having large populations, and there is plenty of evidence that very small populations cannot undertake many of the economic and cultural enterprises which advance civilization. Yet it is easy to exaggerate the size of population assumed to be needed for vigorous social activity. The argument for a large population has most often been an argument of conflict: it has been a demand for armies and military need or ambition.

The demand for a large population is likely to be accompanied by a disregard for its quality. Physically speaking, a population's size is the difference between its birth rate and its death rate, except for the factor of migration. The same size of population may result from a high birth rate accompanied by a high death rate, or a low birth rate together with a low death rate. The former is the method of the lower animal world, while the latter is the trend at least of the more intelligent peoples. The use of intelligence tends toward the elimination of the enormous waste of life which characterizes the lower orders of living things. To bring about such an adjustment between the economic resources which sustain life and

the number of people which can be reasonably cared for by those resources is a great national and world problem. This involves a reduction in the quantity of death and sickness, a relatively high standard of living, an adequate income, a suitable education, and certain moral qualities such as steadiness and forethought, trustworthiness — resting upon courage and a regard for truth — justice, and unselfishness.

Education and income in relation to health. The problem of the health of a people is largely under its own control. It is closely related to the problem of income and the standard of living. Education is also of great importance, particularly education in reference to health and sickness and in reference to the problem of income — its economic basis, vocational skill, wise expenditure, savings and investments. These are not primarily problems of the individual or of the single family; they are problems whose roots are social and which must be met by social, not individual means.

The health of a people varies directly with the way in which it meets health needs. One of the most striking facts of the modern world is the abolition of many diseases and the lengthening of human life. Yet a beginning only has been made, since many of the most serious diseases result from bad housing and too low incomes properly to feed and clothe the family. Nearly eight per cent of the rural population of the United States over ten years of age cannot read and write.[1] The ignorance of many mothers in regard to the birth and care of children is one of the most prolific causes of child death rate. Ten years ago it was estimated by the Children's Bureau that three hundred thousand babies under five years of age died each year, of whom one half might have been saved by reasonable care. Fifteen thousand mothers die in a single year (1917) in childbirth in the United States, most of them needlessly, through lack of knowledge and care. Forty thousand people killed was the accident record of 1920; twenty-two thousand of these being workers in industrial plants. Education of mothers and of girls in regard to the care of children and in regard to health needs, through clinics and other means; better medical and nursing service, particularly in the country; far more adequate schooling of the

[1] *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census* (1920), p. 447.

mass of the people both city and rural; the protection of workers against industrial accident — these are the kinds of social measures which are essential to the physical vigor of a people.

Yet little can be hoped for without adequate family income. An investigation of the Children's Bureau before the War showed that in families in which the father earned $1050 per year, 9.6 per cent of the mothers go out to work; while in families in which the father's income was $450, 73.3 per cent of mothers must go out to work. Investigations in eight cities indicated that families with income under $450 had an infant death rate of 168 per thousand born, while, if the income was $1250, the death-rate was 64; that is to say, a child born in a family with the latter income had more than twice the chance to live of one born in a family with the lower income.[1] The death rate in low-wage occupations is twice the rate for the commercial classes. Evidently measures insuring employment and establishing reasonable minimum wages are essential to the health and vigor of a people.

War and births. In the past few years the number of marriages has been notably reduced by the World War. It has always been true that war tends to affect the rate of marriage. Men of marriageable age are drafted into war activities; the death rate itself grows rapidly; and the uncertainty of income for those who remain behind is greatly increased. Soon there appears a preponderance of women over men in the population and an increase of unmarried women. The census for England indicates that in 1920 in England, Scotland, and Wales, there was an excess of women over men of two million in a total population of forty million. An immediate result is a falling-off in the birth rate. This fall in the birth rate for the years of the War is estimated to have equaled a loss for England, Scotland, and Ireland by the end of 1917 of over five hundred thousand potential lives, while to Germany the loss was between two and three million lives and to France it was one and a half million.[2]

The declining birth rate in the Western World. For the past

[1] United States Children's Bureau, *Annual Report* (1918), p. 11. Quoted in Watkins; *Study of Labor Problems*, p. 64. For other evidence on the problem, see Douglas, Hitchcock, and Atkins: *The Worker in Modern Economic Society*, pp. 317–19.

[2] See Reuter, E. B.: *Population Problems*, pp. 141–42. Also Bogart, E. L.: *Direct and Indirect Costs of the War*, p. 283.

half-century there has been a constant tendency for the birth rate to fall in all countries of the Western World. The population of France before the War had been stationary for many years. The English birth rate began to fall in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and has continued downward to the present, but the fall in the death rate was nearly as great until the War, so that population increase was not greatly affected before 1914. Similar facts are found for Germany, Holland, Scandinavia, Australia, and other countries. On the other hand, there are countries in which the birth rate at the opening of the century was both high and either stationary or rising. They all show a correspondingly high death rate especially for the first year of childhood; Russia's birth rate (1890–1910) was about 44, but her death rate was 30 to 35 (higher than any other large European country) and her infant death rate was thought to be 26. It should be added that on the whole the greatest rate of decline in birth rate is found in the upper and middle economic classes, and the decline is least among the economically poorest class.[1]

Aside from war, two main conditions are usually cited to account for most of this decline. One is physiological; it is the effect of venereal and possibly other diseases. A considerable percentage of marriages which are childless are the result of such diseases. Syphilis and alcohol are called 'racial poisons' in the sense that they both weaken offspring and lower the birth rate. The effects of such diseases pass at once into the life of the family after marriage. A considerable percentage of surgical operations upon women is believed to result from disease brought to the wife by the husband. Too often the vigorous young girl who becomes an invalid after marriage, or whose marriage is followed by childlessness, must place the blame upon her contraction of disease through marriage. And if children are born from such marriages, the possibility of their suffering from blindness or other ills is great.

The moral results are to be seen in the break in the affection between wives and husbands and the destruction of the real unity of family life, leading often to divorce or separation and the neglect of children. There is the highest need that young people before

[1] For data and interesting discussion, see Bushee: *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 274–84. Also Reuter: *Population Problems*, chs. IX, X.

marriage should receive careful education in regard to this problem.

However, though such disease conditions affect the birth rate at all times, it would be impossible to prove that they have increased during the years in which birth rates have been declining. They cannot, therefore, be considered a cause of the decline. The real explanation of the decline is not physiological, but psychological, and is an aspect of the problem of the standard of living and the motives which influence family life. It is a family problem having to do with the ideals and standards governing family life. In considerable degree the restriction on the birth rate is conscious and voluntary on the part of parents, representing a choice between the care of a large family of children, such as was favored by earlier religions and social teaching, and the desire of parents to give better care and education to a smaller number of children. To some extent the desire for an easy life or for pleasures with which the care of children is incompatible, is an influence leading to restriction; this is particularly true of well-to-do families which do not have to weigh the financial problem of the education of children.

Many look with disfavor upon voluntary restriction of the birth rate, while others approve it. The older custom is on the side of the former, while those who believe in a low birth rate and a small family hold that it is wiser to bring to maturity a small number of vigorous and well-educated children than to have a large birth rate, but a high death rate and a relatively ignorant population. It may reasonably be said that if society desires a large population, it must recognize also the growing desire for a higher living standard, with the modern emphasis upon education and the development of the individual. The only way by which these opposing demands may be realized is by a modification in the distribution of income, so that the mass of poorer families may be able to give their children decent and healthful conditions of physical life and a reasonable education. As long as society shows little inclination to do this, it is both foolish and immoral to obtain a large birth rate by demanding that those economically poorer parents who cannot suitably provide for children shall be kept in ignorance of how to prevent the birth of children. Unless society is prepared to find adequate income to care for the children resulting from a high birth rate, it

ought to be both willing and eager to reduce the birth rate, particularly by limiting the size of poorer families.

More important than all other factors in bringing about this change of ideals in regard to the size of the family is the revolution in the position of women. As long as woman was subject to the authority of her husband, her voice in this problem counted for little. But the growth of economic and political freedom for woman, together with her rapid advance in education, has given her power in determining the conditions of child life. This is only one of the vital modifications in the life of society which is due to the changed position of women.

Divorce and desertion. Evidence of the weakening of the unity and stability of the family and the increasing individualizing of its members is found in the growth of divorce and the similar fact of desertion. In the United States, and in Europe to a less degree, divorce has been on the increase for fifty years. It varies in different parts of the world, being most prevalent in those countries and regions which are most free and in which patriarchal family traditions are least powerful.

The rate of divorce is higher in the United States than in any other country except Japan. Within the United States it is highest in the Western States, particularly those which have been most recently settled, as Washington and Montana. More than half the divorces in the United States are granted within the first five years of marriage. They are more common in childless homes than where there are children, a fact which would seem to suggest that children constitute a bond between husband and wife, and that selfishness tends to die in the face of the needs of children. Over two thirds of the divorces are granted to the wife. The legal grounds for divorce in ninety-four per cent of the cases enumerated by the United States Census Bureau, in its study for the period from 1887 to 1906, were desertion, adultery, cruelty, drunkenness, and neglect to provide. About one marriage out of nine in the United States ends in divorce. Such are some of the facts which are commonly cited in describing this problem.

The increase in divorce is not necessarily an indication of increasing immorality or unhappiness. Nor is divorce of itself necessarily

an evil, though evil may often arise from it. Of greatest importance as causes of the increase are the series of economic changes which have taken women into many occupations outside the home, and the more general changes in her social position and life.

Change in the position of women. Woman has always worked, but her work has been a part of the family economic life. The kinds of work which hitherto she has done are now largely carried on outside the home, and she has had to follow the work. Modern organization of business has made many new occupations, also, which are suitable to woman's strength; and the school, which has taken over the education of children, has called for women to teach them. Inevitably these changes have given women a consciousness of the varied economic possibilities before them, and they are less ready to accept home evil conditions because of the pressure of economic need.

With growing economic independence has come 'universal' (and so woman's) education, and with it a recognition on her part of her lack of freedom in the older, often arbitrary, family. Education and economic freedom are the basis of independent thinking, and thinking has led to action. The fact that two thirds of divorces are granted to the wife seems to indicate that women are less bound than formerly by the traditions of marriage permanency and are changing those bonds where the conditions are evil. And, however unpleasant it is, it must be continually borne in mind that the picture of family life presented by the evidence in divorce cases in court — in nine cases out of ten — is one of neglect, of cruelty, of drunkenness, of adultery, and of desertion.

Thus, greater economic and educational opportunity is freeing woman from conditions of cruelty and other evil.

Moral aspects of divorce. On the other hand, divorce often seems to be an indication of a growing disregard for morality. It expresses a selfish absorption in one's own wishes and an unwillingness to make any sacrifice for the common life or to be governed by principles of moral conduct.

In itself divorce is simply a symptom of more fundamental social movements. Changes in industry and in education, criticism of custom, of law, and of morals, the consequent weakening of male

authority, the demand for individual freedom and sex equality, have all had to do with the modification of the older conception of indissoluble marriage. This is probably a transition condition in part; the high divorce rate of to-day may in time be reduced. Meanwhile it needs to be remembered that, though for every divorced family where there are children, there are four such families without children, yet the problem of the care of children occurs often enough to be a serious social aspect of such 'broken' families. In many such cases the harm to children is greater if they remain in the family than to have the family broken. But even a slight observation of divorce-court proceedings will convince any one that many divorces are needless and indicate a simple lack of understanding and of restraint. For many such cases the suggestion and teaching of a good court of 'domestic relations' is often found helpful, and probably the work of this institution should be extended.

Desertion. Desertion is similar to divorce in many respects. It is found most among the poor and the wandering labor class, but also occurs in other social classes. It is a break of the family bond without legal procedure. Both economic conditions and moral laxity contribute to it, and desertion itself often becomes a ground for divorce. Because it occurs mainly among the poor, and because the husband is usually the deserter, charitable societies are constantly required to face the problem of the care of deserted women and children without means of support.

Changing economic and moral influences more fundamental than law. Modifications in the divorce laws of the different States cannot greatly affect the spread of divorce, though some slight degree of improvement may be expected through greater uniformity in the laws and through a more careful statement of the reasonable grounds of divorce. Some improvement may be hoped for from a change in the law of marriage, such as the necessity of an interval of time between the public statement of the intention to marry and the marriage ceremony.

But the divorce problem is socially important primarily because of what it signifies in regard to the changing conditions of family life. It points clearly to three factors of prime importance: first, the sweeping economic changes which are overriding modern

society and which are to some degree undermining this oldest of human institutions; second, the weakening of moral responsibility — itself both consequence and cause of family instability; and, third, the demand for freedom and its reaction upon social life.

For the large laboring class unemployment and the mobility of labor often lower family morale, ending in desertion or divorce; while the work of the mother away from home breaks the usual domestic system of division of labor and leads to family friction. The crowded tenement-house also shares in the responsibility. "It is idle to expect that a squalid tenement in the slums, sending forth in the morning all but its youngest members to labor and receiving them at night to eat and sleep without privacy or comfort, can nourish the sentiments of loyalty, love, and responsibility to their full strength and beauty." [1]

The effect of economic change, however, has also given to women of both the wage-earning and middle groups alternative employment, which results in a growing feeling of independence and less willingness to accept the inevitableness of family life.

In the end there remains the problem of education and morals. The family life is a coöperation; though based on instinct, its finer aspects of mutual love and service are the result of conscious adjustments, of willing sacrifice, of self-restraint, of mutual helpfulness. But these results are not immediate, they are the product of education and experience and conscious effort. Unfortunately, the formal education of young people has had little to do with this problem. It has tended to avoid all discussion of sex-life, leaving them to find their way without guidance, though the problem of personal adjustment between the sexes is most difficult. Young people need a fundamental education in the physiological problems of sex; and equally do they need education in its moral problems. For love and affection are not merely spontaneous sex attraction except in the beginning. In that finer quality which builds the sanctity of the home, they are a growth out of the experience of common purposes, mutual concessions and mutual understanding, continual and willing self-sacrifice for these common ends, and a recognition of the moral responsibility of the life together. Half

[1] Goodsell, W.: *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, p. 468. Copyright, by The Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

the unhappy marriages are failures through the lack of understanding of the moral problems involved and the lack of willingness to make the family a moral unity.

Freedom of woman. It is in the nature of things that the demands of freedom and equality which are so much a part of the trend toward democracy in our day should enter and influence the family in its organization and government. Democracy in the family is ending the older supreme authority of the father; it is opening opportunities to woman, and will ultimately give a position of independence and equality which is nothing short of revolutionary; and it is causing a spread of sympathy for, and appreciation of, the needs of childhood, which, in spite of its occasional exaggeration and resulting laxity of control, holds great promise for the future. In the case of woman's life there has arisen a conflict against man's authority as expressed in the family itself and in government, law, occupations, and education. Woman has demanded that her life as an individual be recognized, as well as her part in the institution of the family. This has led to her struggle for the right to vote and to hold office; her demand for civil rights; her entrance into the professions, business, and nearly every phase of industrial undertaking; and the rapid advance in her education. How to realize these rights of individual womanhood and still maintain a wholesome family life has seemed to many a difficult and menacing problem. Yet no one who looks at the history of half a century can fail to recognize the tremendous gain which society has made as these rights have become realized. The education of women has been one of the chief foundations of the improvement in the life of the family, showing itself in movements for the protection of motherhood, limitation of child labor, the enactment of minimum wages for working-women, and improvement in the health of women and children. The organization of the Federal Children's Bureau is a direct response to the intelligent interest of educated women in the family and its children, as is also much of the great expansion and enrichment of the work of the school.

Women in industry. On the side of industry there are problems in the life of women which are of vital significance, though they can only be stated here. In entering industry outside the home, women

have only obeyed economic necessity. Their former domestic industry has largely become mechanical and is now outside the home. But in following their work they have gained (1) in freedom from male authority, (2) in a consciousness of power which comes with having an independent income, and (3) in a consciousness of the common problems which women face. On the other hand, modern industry has not been at all considerate of the life or needs of womanhood or the family; it has taken advantage of her weakness and has frequently exploited her. The wages which working-women receive are and have regularly been low and usually lower than those paid men; they have been given employments partly because they could be paid less than men. In a careful investigation into twenty-three industries, issued by the Federal Government in 1910, it was found that seventy-three per cent of the employed women eighteen years of age or older received less than eight dollars per week; and forty per cent received less than six dollars.[1] Yet eight dollars per week at the same general period was the smallest amount upon which a woman could live and maintain her health.[2]

The weakness of women in industry is both economic and physical. Economically she is a poor bargainer, due principally to her relative uncertainty in industry. It is necessary to remember that there are eight and one half million women wage-earners in the United States; that about one half of women wage-earners are under twenty-five years of age, and one third are under twenty-one.[3] The prospect of marriage prevents their entrance upon industry in the permanent way which men enter it. The average wage-earning life of women is shorter than that of men. Moreover, the large majority of working-women enter occupations which are of poor grade and in which the chance of advancement is slight. For these and other reasons working-women have not organized for their own protection to any such extent as men, and the fact of the large potential supply keeps their wages down. Yet during the War women took the place of men in many highly skilled occupations and de-

[1] *Women and Children Wage-Earners*, vol. 18. 1916.

[2] See Persons: "Women's Wages in the United States," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. XXIX (1915), p. 201.

[3] *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census* (1920).

monstrated their ability to do the work. Since the War there has been a notable drift on the part of wage-earning women away from domestic service into clerical and professional service, and into trade.

The work of women presents problems of physical weakness also. To a greater extent than men do they suffer from the effects of long hours, high-speed machinery, and standing while at work. Too often the result of fatigue is either accident or physical breakdown which destroys working efficiency as well as joy in life.

Relation to family welfare. The effect of the low wages of women and the consequences of the breakdown of their physical vigor are likely to be reflected in the life of the family and the strength of children. This possibility has brought a public demand for protection of working-women. England, through her Sickness Insurance Act, provides a payment of wages to working mothers for a period before and after children are born, but legislation of this kind is lacking in the United States. The hours of working-women, after nearly a century of struggle, are at last coming to be limited by State law. And more important still is the enactment since 1910 by a number of our States of minimum-wage laws.[1] Such measures as these are but steps in the recognition by society that industry, if left unrestrained, will injure the life of mothers, and will lead to the degeneration of its populations.

The relation of industry to the life of women and to the family has been well summarized by William L. Chenery.[2] He says:

> Industry has thus had divers effects upon the home of the worker. It has taken his wife and his children and through their toil with the aid of machines created fabulous wealth. It has given the worker's wife and daughter an income, but not sufficient to support them. It has been a parasite on the labor of women and children. It has killed babies by depriving them of a mother's care. It has depressed childhood by taking away the opportunity for life out of doors. But the same industry has contributed mightily to the social and economic enfranchisement of women. It has broadened woman's life and given her greater independence of man. It has provided the wealth through which later generations are freeing

[1] But the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional the minimum-wage law of the District of Columbia throws doubt upon the validity of all other similar laws.

[2] *Industry and Human Welfare*, p. 76. Copyright, by The Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

childhood of the immemorial burden of production. In its promise, at any rate, it has been gain for the family.

READING REFERENCES

Fairchild, H. P.: *Applied Sociology*, chs. XI, XII, XIV, XV.
Ellwood: *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, chs. IV to VII.
Kelley, F.: *Modern Industry*, chs. I and II.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, ch. XXXI.
Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology*, ch. XV.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, ch. XXIX.
Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. VIII and IX.
Goodsell, W.: *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, chs. XI–XIV.
Rauschenbusch, W.: *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, ch. V.
Lichtenberger, J. P.: *Divorce*.
Special Reports, United States Census Office: *Marriage and Divorce*.

QUESTIONS

1. Has the attempt ever been made to rear children in any other way than by the family?
2. Find the report of the "Children's Conference" called at Washington by President Roosevelt to discuss the problem of the care of dependent children. See if this conference recommended some better method than care of children in family homes.
3. What prevents the family from adequately protecting the life of its children? Outline.
4. Give a brief sketch of the change in the past fifty years in the position of women, in political rights, in civil status, in education, in industry. Have these changes weakened or strengthened the family?
5. What other institutions have taken over part of the work which at one time was performed by the family?
6. Make a list of the measures which you have seen suggested as of value to prevent the evils of increasing divorce. Do any of them suggest the causes of divorce?
7. Is any modification of the law of marriage or divorce likely to alter the lack of stability in the modern family?
8. Examine the marriage and divorce laws of your State. How might they be improved?
9. In what industrial occupations are women found in the United States? Compare these occupations with varieties of home work in American colonial society.
10. Compare the problem of the maintenance of family unity in a rural community and an industrial city.
11. What causes lead to the postponement of marriage in any class of society? What is the effect upon the birth rate?
12. Study the way in which home-owning affects family unity. Why is home-owning decreasing?

CHAPTER XXI

THE FAMILY AND CHILD WELFARE

Dependence of family welfare upon community life. With the increasing complexity of social life, less and less is the family able of itself to give protection to childhood. And yet here is its basal work — the birth and upbringing of children. But the family is now thoroughly interwoven with the varied social institutions of society; its work is definite and of the highest value; but to accomplish it there must be the intelligent support of the larger community or social organization to which it belongs. In a simple society — to illustrate the situation — the problem of the quality of the food supply is purely a family concern; to-day, if food for children is to be pure, it must be guarded by pure-food laws administered by the agents of community life. This is not because some other social organization, such as the municipal government, has arbitrarily taken this work out of the hands of the family; it is because the family alone is quite unable, in our widely interrelated society, to insure the purity of its food supply. Other illustrations of the same sort will readily suggest themselves.

The study of child welfare and its problems is therefore a study not only of the institution of the family; but in these problems the life of the family and of the larger community meet. In one sense the welfare of children is dependent upon the character of the immediate family; but it is equally true that in a wider sense it is dependent upon the conditions which make for community welfare as a whole. To bring about good life for childhood is, in considerable part, to make good conditions of general community life.

Nevertheless, the social problems of childhood have their special characteristics, and it is necessary to study these briefly, remembering always, however, the close relationship between family and community organization and standards.

Facts which illustrate the problems of child welfare. In 1920 there were in the United States thirty-three and one half million of

children under fifteen years of age, or nearly one third of the total population. Of these, over eighteen and a half million lived in urban centers (places whose population is twenty-five hundred or more) while nearly fifteen million were living in rural places. Twenty-nine and one quarter million were native white stock, though one or both of the parents of nearly eight and one half million of them were foreign. Of foreign-born white children under fifteen there were half a million. And there were nearly three and three quarters million negro children. About eight million children, or half the number of school age, attend one- and two-teacher schools in single-room buildings, their school year averaging one hundred and thirty-seven days.[1] Half of the rural teachers of such schools have not had a four-year high-school education.[2] Ninety per cent of the rural school children do not go beyond the rural school.

In 1920 about one million children between ten and fifteen years of age were at work in the United States earning a living. The number at work under ten years is not known, but is considerable. In Chicago, in 1915, one half the children between fourteen and sixteen who were out of school were idle all the time. In 1913 the special census enumeration found ninety-three thousand dependent children in public homes and fifty thousand in private homes; twenty-five thousand others were held in homes for juvenile delinquents.

Facts such as these suggest that child life is not yet well cared for in the United States; there is to-day no greater waste than the waste of childhood. To prevent this waste is one of the most fundamental of all social problems, and if this waste is to be eliminated certain normal standards for child life must be kept in mind. Assuming that the child has received at birth a suitable or fit inheritance in body and mind, child welfare is dependent upon the following conditions: health, play, and freedom; sufficient income; adequate knowledge; and right associations. These are social standards. They cannot be attained by the child himself, nor is it possible for the mass of families even in the United States to make

[1] United States Bureau of Education, *Biennial Survey of Education* (1916–18), p. 159 *et seq.*

[2] United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 49, *Efficiency and Preparation of Rural School Teachers* (1914), p. 24.

these conditions prevail. Very largely they are dependent upon the organized activity of community life as a whole, and the test of the level of community life is largely the degree to which it has consciously made possible these standards and conditions.

Child health. The basis of child welfare is physical health, and the problem of health is one of the major problems of community life. As this problem is discussed later, only one or two aspects will be suggested here. While it is known that a percentage of children are born with inherited weakness of body and mind, it is also known that the great majority are not in this class. Their healthy growth to manhood or womanhood is dependent upon the social environment in which they are placed. To state the matter concretely, certain aspects of the social surroundings may be suggested. Undoubtedly poverty is the prime or underlying cause of the high death rate of infants and also of children of later age. Poverty attacks child life both indirectly through the mother and also directly. Forty-six per cent of infant deaths occur during the first month of life; a part of this high death rate is due to poverty and accompanying ignorance of the mother before as well as after the birth of the child. The babies of mothers who go out to work are more likely to die than those of mothers who remain in the home. On the average it is true also that the poorer the housing condition — largely determined by the rent — the more babies die. The condition of much the greatest weight, however, and of which the preceding are simply aspects, is the lack of family income. The studies of the Federal Children's Bureau indicate that doubling the income reduces the infant death rate by more than one half.[1] Ignorance and poverty go together; it is to be expected, therefore, that where poverty prevails the ignorance of mothers will be an important cause of infant death, and this is found to be the case. As a consequence all plans for improvement emphasize the giving of instruction to expectant mothers in regard to the care both of babies and of older children.[2] And because of the fundamental character

[1] See the interesting summary by Julia C. Lathrop (at that time Chief of the Children's Bureau), "Income and Infant Mortality," in *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 9, p. 270.

[2] The Maternity and Infant Hygiene Act (Sheppard-Towner Act), passed by Congress in 1921, makes provision for Federal appropriations to each State which ac-

of the economic condition of the family, it seems both reasonable and essential to urge the need of a minimum family wage and of community control of the housing problem.

Dependent children. Particular problems in child welfare which arrest the attention of society to-day, and which society must face, are problems of dependent children, delinquent children, and child laborers.

The problem of dependent children has always existed, but, with the general weakening of the family as a protective institution and the growing mobility of populations, there is an increase in child dependency; and the question of what to do becomes more difficult to answer.

Several groups of children make up the total of child dependents. Primarily they are the result of the death of one or both parents, with no kindred to care for them. Besides orphaned children or children of divorced parents, dependency is caused by conditions of family destitution, incompetency, and immorality; and the illegitimate child makes a further unfortunate addition to the total. In all of these cases there is evidently a failure of the family to perform its social function, and therefore society is driven to find some other method of care for these children. For some the family never has existed, for others it is broken, and for still others it is unfit.

To meet the needs of dependent children there have arisen both public and private agencies, of all kinds and of every degree of efficiency and inefficiency. Private agencies have usually been brought into existence through sympathy with the needs of childhood, and often their value has been beyond measure. But sympathy is not necessarily intelligent, nor is it always supplied with funds adequate to maintain reasonable standards; often, too, the original sympathetic impulse has in time faded away and its place been taken by a dull routine or even evil purpose. It is for such reasons as this that there has grown a conviction among capable students of child welfare that society has no right to leave the care of its dependent children to private charity, nor should private child-

cepts the conditions of the gift. The money is to be spent upon a program of "protection for maternity and infancy." More than forty States had accepted appropriations under the Act by the end of 1923.

caring agencies be permitted to work without some degree of public oversight. The statement of minimum "standards for children in need of special care," drawn up by the Washington Conference in 1919, emphasizes the importance of a responsible State supervising body to "inspect and license every institution, agency, or association which receives or cares for mothers with children, or children who are delinquent, dependent, or without suitable parental care — with authority to revoke licenses for cause and to prescribe forms of registration and report." [1]

Public agencies to care for dependent children have their beginnings in this country in the county and its almshouse. In our own day it has come to be well recognized that this is an utterly unfit institution for children. The principle of segregation is accepted — that is, the separation and separate treatment of each group of those who need care. The establishment by the State or the municipality of "institutional homes" for children; the separate treatment of blind, deaf, defective, and delinquent children; and the development of State boards of administration with varying powers, are steps in the growth of the public care of dependents. Ultimately it has come to be somewhat generally realized and accepted, however, that, except for those children who need some special treatment, such as the feeble-minded, institutional establishments of any kind should be avoided as far as possible. The family home is so much to be preferred that every effort should be made to bring children under its influence. At the White House Conference called by President Roosevelt in 1909 to consider problems of child welfare, it was declared in the summary of its discussion, "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization." The prime effort, therefore, to-day is to find suitable family homes for dependent children. Where fathers are dead, the policy of giving public aid to mothers with children in order that the mothers need not go out to work, leaving the children alone and uncared for, is well established and is found in the laws of many States, though the amounts granted for the purpose are still usually inadequate. Where there are no living parents or the home is unfit, the organiza-

[1] Julia C. Lathrop: "Standards of Child Welfare," in vol. 98, Nov., 1921, *Child Welfare, Annals*, American Academy of Political and Social Science.

tion of home-placing arrangements has been undertaken both by private philanthropy and ultimately by States. To carry out this policy intelligently and skillfully requires the best of training and judgment as well as the financial outlay which is usually possible only through the State. Miss Julia Lathrop, for so many years the able head of the Federal Children's Bureau, states[1] the now well-accepted principles in regard to the family, as follows:

> No child should be permanently removed from his home unless it is impossible to make the home safe for the child or his continuance in the home safe for the community. The aim of all provision for children who must be removed from their own homes should be to secure for each child home life as nearly normal as possible. . . . To a much larger degree than at present, family homes may be used to advantage in the care of such children.

It is well to remember that the normal family is a protective institution for childhood and that unprotected children are easily abused and exploited by evil men and their characters twisted and warped by wrong association. In the nature of things all the better forces of society should unite to provide the necessary protection for its children. Dependent children are simply those for whom the normal protective organization is lacking; they become, therefore, a special group whose welfare demands from society as a whole a special guardianship.

Delinquent children. Delinquency refers to conduct. It suggests that the law has been broken; but the tendency of our own day is to consider as delinquent children any whose conduct points toward the probable breaking of law. Knowledge of the child mind makes it impossible to-day to think of each act of a child as a thing by itself, nor can it be held that a child is able clearly to discern the moral meaning of his conduct. The child's understanding of right and wrong is a growth and the result of the social environment about him acting upon his inborn nature.

To understand why boys and girls go wrong is the first step toward knowing what ought to be done about it. The problem may be studied from the external point of view, considering what are the factors in society which affect the child's life and influence the

[1] *Op. cit.*, *Annals*, Amer. Acad., November, 1924.

growth of his character. It may also be approached by an examination of the growing mind and character, to see what qualities are revealed which point toward the probability of wrong behavior. But after all these are two aspects of one fact. Character is a product in which the inner element is continually reacting to the outer, and the outer is forever impressing itself upon the life as a whole. The possibility of reducing delinquency lies in modifying the varied stimulations found in the social environment. The growing mind is open to suggestion; the kinds of associations which are made determine largely the quality of these suggestions and direct the lines of stimulation which are most likely to be effective in the life of youth.

In a considerable number of cases heredity is the basis of delinquency. The clinical methods of examination of cases make this clear again and again. Weakness of intelligence or of will lays one open to suggestion; nervous instability or irritability or a taint of hereditary insanity are conditions, too, which may predispose one from birth to conduct hostile to society. It is probably impossible at present to know how large a percentage of delinquency is due mainly to bad heredity; students vary in their judgment very greatly, and it will perhaps never be possible to measure with certainty the exact size of this factor. Yet it is very real and must be understood. It is probably fair to say that something like twenty-five per cent of such delinquent youths as are found in reformatories show the marks of an inherited weakness of mind; certain kinds of reformatories probably show a higher per cent. But reformatories contain, in all probability, a higher per cent of the feeble-minded than is found in the total number of delinquents, the more vigorous-minded being more likely to escape detection or arrest.

It is, however, true that the greater number of delinquent youths have a reasonably normal heredity. The various influences of social life have failed to build in them virile character or have deliberately predisposed them to the life of crime. It is not, of course, meant that an upright life cannot be lived in the midst of unfavorable environment; but the proportion of those who fail is sure to be larger than if social conditions were more favorable. The business of society is, therefore, to study its own life in order to build

those conditions which shall make good conduct easy rather than difficult.

Social factors in delinquency. Among factors of the social environment to be considered is the character of the home. Out of the home broken by death, desertion, divorce, sickness, or poverty is almost certain to come a high percentage of bad conduct. And the distinctly evil home, in which is found immorality or crime itself, must be an even more prolific background of delinquency.

The relationship of youth to work is another factor of importance. The discontent which results from 'blind-alley' occupations leads easily to petty crime. Routine types of work which supply no incentive of interest often lead to outbursts of more or less extravagant and dangerous conduct which easily becomes criminal. Lack of vocational training, overwork, and bad types of work too easily drive youth to look upon the life of the criminal as an adventure to be played with and perhaps at last to be followed.

The relationship of youth to play is an equally important factor in delinquency. It is not until recently that society has begun to recognize the necessity of play for normal life and healthy growth. Particularly for youth is it true that play, and the freedom and spontaneity which accompany it, are as necessary as food and fresh air. Too largely have social arrangements been built on the basis of the work life and too little has the play life been considered. The lack of provision for a place to play, time for play, direction in play — this has often been the beginning of delinquency. It is easy for play to become crime and for crime to be play.[1]

Work and play are the basis of most of the associations and companionships of youth outside the home. Delinquency is usually a fact and an outgrowth of association or companionship. So to govern the conditions of work and of play that they shall be both interesting and wholesome is at the same time to organize suitable and helpful associations.

Poverty also is always to be reckoned with. It is not usual that youth is led into crime by the pressure of starvation; but it is too often true that poverty is the background out of which other un-

[1] See *Report on Recreation Centers*, New York City Board of Education, 1912. Cf. also Jane Addams: *The Spirit of Youth and the City Street.*

favorable conditions grow. Ignorance, bad housing in congested neighborhoods, evil associations and familiarity with vice and crime, overwork, few legitimate pleasures — these are conditions which poverty breeds; they in their turn breed wrong conduct and crime.

Lack of civic or community interest and of oversight of the entire problem of youth is an important aspect of delinquency. Too readily communities assume that to the family or the school can be left the responsibility to meet the problem of developing good conduct in youth; this in spite of the fact that in every community both family and school are tangled in a mass of other institutions which weaken them or compete with them in their influence upon character. The city street and the village corner have bred evil faster than home or school could build righteousness. Institutions and social problems are not isolated phenomena; they are all interrelated expressions of a general way of living and thinking. The life of the community as a whole is reflected in the wholesomeness of its juvenile life; the community must accept the responsibility for the organization of the agencies of its own upbuilding.

Looking at the problem as a whole from the subjective or personal side, it will be found that youth goes wrong because of three conditions: *the thwarted life, the empty life, the undisciplined life*

While the normal impulses of child life need direction, they should not be disregarded. The impulse to play — to use this as an illustration — is for the child an imperious driving force, social in character because play is social. Where children and youth begin to work at an early age and are kept at monotonous tasks for long hours, the thwarting of the play impulse is likely to express itself in outbursts such as characterize the runaway boy or girl, or in thieving as a game. In the country boy or girl the desire for companionship as well as play reacts against the isolation as well as the frequent hardship of long hours of work, and breaks forth in the form of discontent, destruction of property, brawls, stealing, sex offenses, or flight in response to the lure of the unknown. Curiosity, the desire to own, the impulse toward the new which is the basis of adventure, companionship, play, sex attraction — such impulses as these are normal and are the basis of normally developing character. But the industrial organization and the kinds of work into which

too frequently youth drifts, the congested character of city districts, the poverty or ignorance of family life, and lack of income to satisfy these impulses in normal ways, lead to the effort to satisfy them in ways which are harmful to the youth as well as to society. It is this aspect of the problem of youth and delinquency which Miss Addams has in mind when she speaks of "the starved instinct for joy and companionship."

The empty life is a life without controlling interest and purpose. It is very likely to be the outcome of the thwarted life. The great organizers and directors of wholesome life are the permanent interests of life. Real interests become absorbing forces which leave no time, no energy, no desire to waste. It is the business of education to build such interests as shall be wholesome and shall lead to progressive growth in character and conduct. It is the mark of the worst failure of both family and school that too often they do not in any degree succeed in arousing in youth vital interests — such interests as are found in fine work, in the imitation of big and outstanding character, in constructive effort in one or another of the professions or in business, or in a desire for service to humanity. The crowd on the corner, the poolroom loafer, the street-walker are too frequent illustrations of the lack of any gripping, vital interest; the empty, drifting life easily degenerates into evil.

The life which is held steady is subject to discipline. The one which is swayed by every passing impulse is undisciplined. An element of compulsion is undoubtedly necessary in the development of discipline, but society has relied upon compulsion with consequent failure. Routine is also an element in discipline, but it is slow to act, and often becomes itself the impulse to break away from discipline. The prime basis of discipline is interest: where interest is aroused, it becomes the maker of habits which govern character and direct life.

A very large part of juvenile delinquency expresses an undisciplined life, one in which there are no principles of conduct which are wrought into habit and which govern life. The ability to sacrifice the impulse of the moment for the sake of something bigger or finer has not developed. A wayward, unrestrained, and ultimately degenerate life results. The failure of the family, the school, the

neighborhood, the church, to build discipline into the will is a vital aspect of our changing social world. The problem is central and cannot be passed by as unimportant. Normal impulses with opportunity for expression, dominated by intelligent, socially wise and educated interests, will build real discipline into youth and bring it to vigorous and wholesome manhood.

Community and family responsibility for prevention of delinquency. The social problem of delinquency is primarily one of prevention. The key is the making easily possible wholesome and stimulating contacts. This demands of society that in every community there should be an effort (1) to strengthen the normal agencies of child control — especially the family, and (2) to build, where necessary, auxiliary social agencies. The development of community recreation through directed playgrounds is an illustration of the first; so also is the effort to improve housing, and those measures of social control over industrial life which look toward the elimination of sweatshop work and the limitation of child labor, accompanied by vocational training and direction of vocational interest by the school.

As illustrating what is meant by auxiliary agencies, mention may be made of the Boys' Club movement, the purpose of which is to furnish companionship and active recreation, and to build wholesome interests and ideals. Judge Arnold, of the Chicago Juvenile Court, in describing the work of the Union League Boys' Club of that city, says that, nine months after the organization of a boys' club in one of the most congested districts, a survey showed that cases of delinquency had dropped off just seventy per cent.

The juvenile court. While prevention is the only ultimately successful method for social betterment, the immediate problem demands immediate action. The rapid increase of delinquency and a better understanding of the nature of the growing mind have led to the establishment of the juvenile court, which is a peculiarly American organization, to meet this problem. Beginning in Chicago in 1899 and in Denver in the same year, these courts have spread over the United States and have been studied and imitated abroad. Their purpose is to remove delinquent children from the environment of the adult court, and to substitute a kindly and intelligent

effort to understand the motives and character of the child, instead of the effort to maintain the dignity of the law and to inflict punishment with reference to the importance of the offense to society. Discarding more technical procedure, the best of these courts have developed methods of psychological and physical examination, a system of probation, methods of family examination and instruction, detention homes and temporary education, and many other features. One of the most important results has been a better understanding of child delinquency and a more scientific basis for its treatment.

Many students believe that the juvenile court should become or be associated with a court of domestic relations, since the problems dealt with are so largely family problems. Others advocate the taking over of the main part of the work of the juvenile court by the school, since the school and its teaching staff, both by training and position, are, it is thought, better fitted than any court to study and handle problems of childhood. It is right to say, however, that these courts represent a transition in the treatment of childhood; what their future will be is impossible to say; but it seems probable that for some time "neither the school nor other agencies can successfully take the place of the court in cases involving delinquency, guardianship, and parental abuse."[1] The immediate necessity is to strengthen the juvenile courts, for it is true that many of them have not reached a high standard of efficiency.

Meanwhile the problem of delinquency has been rapidly growing. The survey of the Cleveland Foundation in 1921 estimates that in that city "juvenile delinquency is increasing from five to six times as fast as the population." The necessity is manifest for a protection of child life which calls for the united effort of all the upbuilding agencies of society.

Child labor. It is probable that not far from 1,500,000 children under sixteen years of age are at work in the United States earning their living.[2] Of these, sixty per cent are in agriculture, and little

[1] H. W. Thurston: National Conference for Social Work, 1922.

[2] The Census figures for 1920 are 1,060,850 between ten and fifteen years of age inclusive. No report is made of those under ten years, though it is known that large numbers are employed, particularly in agriculture. See Bulletin, Children's Bureau, *Child Labor in the United States.*

of the child-labor interest or legislation applies to them. Interest has child labor was first aroused in reference to those in manufacture. 219. later, as cities grew in size the conditions of children in the trades, especially the so-called 'street' trades, claimed attention; and at last interest is being aroused in rural children engaged in agriculture.

Modern industry creates a demand for child workers. It is in this problem of child labor that the influence of the industrial order of society upon the family is most evident. Children will ultimately become the labor supply of society: at what age, after what training, under what conditions, should they enter the life of work? Will they be more effective workers if they enter industrial life early or late, and will society lose productive power and wealth by one or the other of these policies? Are there considerations which are not industrial which society must hold in mind; as, for example, the effect of child work upon education and upon preparation or fitness for citizenship and social life? Should training for industry be carried on by the school or by industry itself? The family begins the education and training of the child; the school continues this oversight and guidance; industry competes with these institutions, drawing children away from the family and away from the school. Is it to the interest of society to limit or restrain industry in this competitive struggle, by establishing standards of social welfare to which industry must conform and by which it must be guided?

These are the kinds of questions which suggest the nature of this problem. To understand it, one must realize that the mechanical revolution which has been going on in the world for over a hundred years has made a large number and variety of kinds of work which children and young people may do without training. The increasing size of industrial establishments and the centralization of ownership of capital removes the probability of a personal relationship between workers and managers, so that protection of immature workers based upon considerations of sympathy or of social welfare is not to be expected. The aim of industry is profit and its policy is certain to be controlled by that aim. Society, on the other hand, is interested in its children, in their ultimate efficiency

roducers, but also in their growth in personal power and vigor, eir general intelligence, and their participation in the possibilities of a happy life.

In the older world, before the modern industrial system was developed, the family was itself the organizer of industry. There was little or no competition between industry and the family, so that children were not drawn away from the protection of the family through entering industry. In so far as the family wished to protect, and was intelligent enough to protect, its children, it could do so, except for the existence of general poverty, which, however, did not break the family organization as it tends to do to-day. Nor were the means of education outside the family competed with by industry, since the school existed only for relatively leisure-class children.

Legal protection for children. The main protection which societies have placed about children in regard to work is in the form of child-labor laws, school-attendance laws, and 'industrial-welfare' or minimum-wage laws. England first saw the need of protective legislation; in 1802 Parliament passed its first very limited act which applied only to orphan children. Gradually it became clear in all the Western world that the competition of industry is often too strong to be resisted by the family, both because of poverty and the cupidity and ignorance of parents. That the meager wage which children can earn is considered of importance to the family income is clear from the fact that studies of family income in the United States indicate that a very large percentage of families earn below the minimum amount necessary for maintenance of physical efficiency, and that children are regular contributors to the income of these low-wage families. Child-labor laws have therefore gradually increased in number and importance as the problem itself has grown. In the United States such laws have been passed by the separate States, but these laws are far from uniform, some of them giving comparatively slight protection. Mr. Herbert Hoover in a recent address said: "A majority of States have forward-looking and effective laws in child protection; some others have enacted legislation that at least goes part way. But there is a minority that are still in the Middle Ages in their attitude

to childhood." Therefore the Congress of the United States has also passed two child-labor laws, one in 1916 and the second in 1919. Both of these laws, however, have been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, so that the possibility of a uniform law applying to the whole United States depends upon the passage of an amendment to the Federal Constitution which will give Congress the power to enact such a law. Such an amendment has recently (1924) been passed by Congress, but has not yet been ratified by the necessary three fourths of the States.

Two causes of child labor. There are two prime conditions which cause child labor. The first is poverty, and the second is the failure of the school to interest children and so to hold them. The fact that a large majority of children must and expect to become workers, and that schools have not until recently recognized the economic drive which must thus be faced, has had much to do with the lack of interest in school attendance. The effort to make school work in part vocational in character is an important advance in modern educational discussion and practice; if adequately carried out, much may be hoped from it in the way of keeping children in school rather than at work. Poverty, however, underlies the whole problem. It drives children to work through sheer family need, or through the ignorance and discontent which poverty causes. It is this, therefore, which makes it so easily possible for the factory to undermine the family and the school. The economic problem which expresses itself in low wages must be faced and met by society if it really wishes to give adequate protection to its children.[1]

The long period of time which must be spent before children have reached the development by which they are able to care for themselves necessitates social agencies of protection in a way quite different from the lower animal world. The higher the animal kind, the longer the age of infancy, or, to give it a different name, the age of social education. There is no progress in animal societies from generation to generation, so the period of learning need not be long; but human society is cumulative, each generation building on the

[1] Woodbury, in his survey of *The Working Children of Boston*, found that "from one third to two fifths of the children at work left school because of family economic need" (p. 99).

experience and discovery of those which precede it, so that human life grows very complex, and the process of adjustment must necessarily be long. To aid in such adjustment, society has developed such institutions as the family and the school. When industry draws children away from family care and from the activities of the school, it cuts across these most valuable means of developing childhood.

Child labor not of educational value. It is sometimes held that industry itself gives training to the children who work for it, educating them in 'the school of life.' This claim makes it necessary to understand the kinds of work which children do and the effect upon them, both in body and mind. It may be accepted as a definite principle that the period of so-called 'childhood' ought to prepare children to work as a part of its social aim.

Industry to-day is becoming more and more a machine process. This results in jobs which require no skill and do not prepare for any other or better grade of work. This is the kind of work which children do. A careful investigation of this problem in Massachusetts in 1906 revealed the fact that in that State there were twenty-five thousand children between fourteen and sixteen years of age who were not in school, five sixths of whom had not completed the eighth grade of school. Of this number only two per cent had entered skilled or high grade industries; the remainder, if at work, were in industries which required very little skill or none at all, and which held no promise for the future.) More recent studies in St. Louis, Philadelphia, and New York estimate that the number of such children who have entered high-grade industries is from three to five per cent. Such low-grade kinds of work as children usually do are commonly called 'blind-alley' jobs because they do not prepare for skilled work; in other words, *child labor is not a preparation for the work of adult life.* Instead, it tends rather to unfit children for a higher grade of work, by destroying ambition, thwarting natural curiosity and inventiveness, and breeding discontent. It has been found that juvenile delinquency is from two to ten times as great among juvenile workers as among school children. It is also found that, as a natural consequence of such work, children who work do not stay long in one job. They drift from place to place,

being out of work at least a quarter of the time. There is no longer any question in regard to the conclusion that industry to-day does not afford a suitable preparation for adult work. It is a great waster of child life, and it wastes because children are cheap, failing to recognize that, though cheap from the wages viewpoint, they are the hope of civilization.

Harmful conditions of work. The conditions under which children work are also often directly harmful to body and mind. Long hours endanger health and increase accident; the per cent of accidents to children in factories is much higher than for adults,[1] and there are still (1922) fourteen States which do not limit to eight hours the working day for children over fourteen. Fortunately all but four of the States forbid night work for children under sixteen; though, of the State laws which do forbid it, there is great difference in the nature and thoroughness of the provisions. Night work is especially bad for children, both physically and morally. Particularly is this true of certain of the street trades such as the messenger service, where the associations are deplorably evil. Many children are at work in unwholesome industries where they must draw into growing lungs vegetable or mineral dust or carry poison to the blood through the alimentary canal. Cotton manufacturing is an industry especially dangerous because the cotton lint in the lungs predisposes to tuberculosis. Yet many thousands of children are at work in the cotton industry.

The problem may then be briefly summarized: The industries which use children are not usually of value as a preparation for adult work, often even reducing their efficiency. The conditions governing such industries are physically harmful to children and too often are morally degenerating. The actual money earnings are slight, and in the long run the effect is to lower adult wages through competition; yet poverty drives children to such work, since in many families the wages of the father are below the amount needed to maintain minimum living standards. In spite of various defects, the school and the family offer the best means of

[1] See statistics for several investigations quoted in Watkins: *Study of Labor Problems*, p. 136. The *Report of the Industrial Commission* (vol. XIX, p. 917) indicates that boys under sixteen had twice as many accidents as adult men, and girls under sixteen three times as many accidents as adult women.

preparation for life; these are society's tested agencies: but child labor removes children altogether from the educational atmosphere of the school and weakens the influence of the home.

Standards suggested. A conference called by the Children's Bureau in 1919 formulated a statement of "minimum standards for children entering employment." These suggest an age minimum, educational minimum, physical minimum, hours of employment, a minimum wage, supervision of placement and employment, compulsory school attendance, factory inspection, and other matters of administration. The purpose of such standards is to safeguard the life of growing youth and to prepare it for vigorous and effective industrial and social manhood and womanhood. The effort is to bring together the prohibitions upon child-labor and the compulsory-school attendance laws into a single harmonious code, based upon our scientific knowledge of the physical and mental needs of growth and an understanding of the nature of present industry. The standards demand among other things school attendance nine months each year from seven to sixteen years of age, with part-time school and part-time occupational work between sixteen and eighteen for those who do not go on with full-time school work; physical examination annually up to eighteen years to determine fitness to be employed; an eight-hour day up to eighteen years; night work prohibited; a minimum wage for minors at work, based on the cost of living; a central agency to deal with all problems of juvenile employment.

Summary in regard to the family. It is evident that the greatest of institutions established to aid the family in the care of childhood is the school. It is not, however, possible at this point to discuss the school in its relation to child welfare. Through it standards for the care of children have been set which improve the practice of multitudes of families and which make it possible for the family itself to be a progressive institution. The place of the school in social life is briefly considered in Part V. Other problems, also, of child welfare must be omitted. Here the effort has been to bring out the nature of the family, and to discuss briefly some of the varied problems which have their roots in this funda-

mental institution. The progress of democracy in community and social life is influencing all institutions. Among them the family is changing from an institution based on the authority of the male head to one in which there is an increasing degree of individual freedom and therefore of individual responsibility. While this change has its menacing aspect, it also has its promise. Democracy in the family is a natural consequence of the spread of education, and suggests the possibility of family unity and discipline based upon choice and mutual service as compared with the discipline of fear. Yet it is necessary for society to recognize clearly that the industrial struggle for profit, if left unrestrained by social action, will undermine and destroy this most valuable of all social institutions.

READING REFERENCES

Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, chs. XIX and XX.

Addams, J.: *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil.*

Addams, J.: *The Spirit of Youth and the City Street.*

Breckinridge, S. P., and Abbott, G.: *The Delinquent Child and the Home.*

Clopper, E. N.: *Child Labor in City Streets.*

Eliot, T. D.: *The Juvenile Court and the Community.*

Fairchild, H. P.: *Applied Sociology*, ch. XV.

Fuller, R. G.: *The Meaning of Child Labor.*

Fuller, R. G.: *Child Labor and the Constitution.*

Mangold, G. B.: *Problems of Child Welfare* (revised edition), especially part I, chs. I to III, and parts IV, V, and VI.

Standards of Child Welfare: Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

Thurston, H. W.: *Delinquency and Spare Time.*

Trend of Child Labor in the United States: Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

Rural Child Welfare: National Child Labor Committee, chs. II, IV, V.

The American Child (journal published by the National Child Labor Committee).

QUESTIONS

1. During which year of childhood is there the greatest death rate? What preventive measures are of importance to prevent this?
2. Examine the special reports of the Children's Bureau for evidence of any relation between child death rate and family poverty?
3. Why is it believed that all institutions which care for dependent children should be under governmental inspection?
4. Give a sketch of the rise and character of juvenile courts. Are they thoroughly approved institutions? Are there objections to them? Explain.

5. Why is there not a Federal child-labor law in the United States? What advantages are there in having such a Federal law as compared with State laws?
6. Why have child-labor laws not applied to rural children? Is this wise?
7. Are compulsory school-attendance laws similar in effect to child-labor laws? Explain.
8. Do employers find child labor cheap in the long run?

CHAPTER XXII

THE ECONOMIC ORDER

Production of wealth always a social fact. Nothing is more marked in the evolution of man than the difference, from one historic age to another, in the means by which he makes his living. This difference is of two sorts: it is, first, a question of tools, and, second, a question of the arrangement or grouping of men in the using of tools and their products. Each of these facts is cumulative: that is, in each field — tools and industrial organization of men — each period or age builds upon that which goes before. In this dependence of one age of society upon preceding ages, in the production of the means of life, it is evident that production is a social fact rather than an individual one. The same point of view is suggested also by the way in which ideas of order, of organization, of coöperation, and of rights and duties arise and are bound up with the methods of production of a given people or period, changing more or less completely as the industrial methods change. In the study of the economic order, it is necessary at the beginning to realize that *production of the means of life is always social.* Individuals, indeed, work and struggle, or avoid work, as the case may be, but the individual never, except in rare isolation, creates wealth alone; always he works in a system with other men, using tools which are themselves the product of successive generations of invention. The ideas which express the way in which he works with other men constitute the industrial system; this is a social-economic environment without which he could not work as he does and upon which he is utterly dependent for his success or failure. It is natural for a man to feel that what he makes he produces by himself unaided; yet just as the atmosphere determines the possibility of his living, so the economic ideas and principles accepted by his society are the basis of the possibility of his working at all. Work is done by groups and on the basis of group or social ideas about the relations of men at work.

Function and problems of the economic order. The primary

function of the economic order is to support physical life, but it goes beyond this. Human life is not an economic fact, but it is conditioned by economic facts. That is to say, the effort to keep alive is the foundation upon which the finer aspects of life are built. The economic order and its institutions must then be tested and judged by their success, first, in enabling people to live, and, second, in enabling them to live well. But the economic life is the basis of power, and men as individuals and groups seek power. The production of goods thus becomes subject to the struggle for power, and this perverts or weakens the success of economic life in ministering to human welfare.

Limitations upon the success of economic institutions which prevent them from serving society are of five kinds: (1) physical nature or geography may be unfavorable; (2) knowledge of how to produce (skill in production) may be inadequate; (3) the direct effect of the processes of production may be harmful to, or destructive of, the worker; (4) what is produced may be badly distributed, so that in spite of sufficient production many suffer; (5) there may be lack of understanding of how wisely to use or consume what is produced, so that there is waste; or, as a consequence, misdirection of energy through the production of goods which are harmful or inferior in ministering to life. These are not five distinct problems; each is an aspect of the others.

The economic order thus is made up in part of knowledge of how to make nature serve man's needs; in part it has to do with ideas and principles to determine how socially to control the producing process and how to divide what is produced among the members of society; and in part it embodies ideas as to what is best worth while to produce and what should govern the standards and behavior of men in consuming goods.

I. Evolution in Economic Life

Technique and social organization. The steps by which men have discovered nature, in their effort to find a living, mark off one stage of social life from another. At a given time the knowledge men have, as shown in their tools, their workmanship, and their industrial organization, makes up the *technical* basis of the life of

society. Therefore, we may state briefly the conclusion which is accepted by many students of social evolution: The progress of mankind from prehistoric times to civilization rests primarily upon the development of tools by which nature became subject to man's need, and upon the development of speech which made possible the expansion of association between men through mental contacts resulting in the growth of reasoning and the organization of effective societies. The basic aspect of societies is probably the struggle to live, so that the invention of tools, on the one hand, and the organization of societies, on the other, go together. It is easy to recognize the importance of tools in social evolution; it is not so easy to appreciate the significance of the forms and character of association or society, particularly in its industrial organization, as underlying human progress. Yet it is beyond question that the difference between early man and civilized man is not a difference between individual natural abilities, but between the character of societies. As Mueller-Lyer says in his *History of Social Development:* [1]

> It is not to his individual power and supremacy that man owes his superiority over the animal kingdom, but to his union with other men into a powerful organization whose widespread system of mutual support is effective throughout the whole earth. . . . There is an enormous contrast between a modern great state and a tribe of Veddas or of Australian aborigines, but the difference between an *individual* Vedda or an Australian on the one hand and a European on the other is relatively insignificant.

Before the period of written historical records, man had already gone far in the making of tools. So important for his development is the making of tools that it is customary to describe the stage of economic development by the materials used. Thus, in prehistoric times man passed from the Stone Age to the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. Evidently fire had been discovered. Important in the making of tools, it is probably the most useful of all early discoveries.

Closely related to progress in tool-making is the growth in food supply and the means of obtaining it. Through the hunting and fishing stage man advanced to the provision of his own food supply in pastoral and agricultural life, and ultimately into commerce.

[1] F. C. Mueller-Lyer: *History of Social Development*, p. 58. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Within historic epochs we find societies representing all of these stages of economic life. They are not entirely distinct, either, but overlap and are closely interrelated. In the brief statement which can be made here, it is to be remembered that long before our own age tools of the greatest variety and excellence were employed by a great many peoples, even to the use of simple machines. Until the modern era and the invention of the steam engine, following the earlier invention of printing, the main tools of man found in Europe had been employed for hundreds and even thousands of years.

Just as tools have gone through a series of stages of invention, so the organization of the users of tools — that is, industrial organization — has passed through successive stages. Specialization by occupation, resulting from division of labor, gradually developed distinct occupational standards and classes. The interchange of goods through a medium of exchange gave a spur to the acquisitive impulse, built habits of possession, and intensified the desire to own, eventually separating men into owning and non-owning groups, and so into masters and servants. Emphasis could easily come to be laid upon one kind of ownership rather than another, depending upon the kind of economic life which the tools and economic organization — that is, the industrial technique of society — demanded. Thus wealth in cattle was the key to economic success among pastoral nomads or modern cattlemen, while land-ownership constituted social power for an agricultural people; and in our own day the mechanism of commerce — the financial organization of the administration of capital — dominates social machinery and gives authority, distinction, and power to those who possess it.

Thus it may be seen that in regard to the human aspect, all production of goods is a group process, a working together of many individuals. Except in the simplest and rather unusual situations, there always is division of work between different kinds of workers, leading eventually to different occupations. Such a division of labor is possible only through some sort of organization. If the determination and control of the terms of the plan of organization and their acceptance rest upon the authority of one part of society — individual or class — and is thus forced upon the others, there is the institution of master and slave, or slavery. This type

of economic organization ruled the world's industry for ages and was socially accepted. It was the basis of the autocratic type of government which in political life has lasted to our own day. In industry a further step was taken and slavery gave way to a kind of voluntary agreement with regard to the terms of the organization of industry. By this system no individual can compel another by the use of force to become a worker in the organized scheme of division of labor; but if the plan is accepted, the result is a contract — that is, an accepted agreement. Thus slavery has passed away and wage contract has taken its place.

It is, however, not to be assumed that the organization of this division of labor — this interrelated industrial grouping of workers based on contract and not physical compulsion — gives equal or fair terms or is satisfactory to all those who accept it. The advantage of drawing up the plan of organization and of deciding upon its terms is almost or entirely in the hands of one part of society, so that the others, though not physically compelled to accept (as in slavery), have no alternative open, and are thus economically compelled by the desire to live. This system of contract and wage payment is the outgrowth of (1) the institution of property and of (2) the concentration of control of the mechanism of production. This is what is meant by *capitalism*.

The possibility of a free industrial coöperation, a system for organizing the various related factors in the division of labor, freely and willingly entered because the plan itself is made by all the factors, not by one, and therefore aims at conditions and terms just to all, is a goal of industry which is suggested by the term *industrial democracy*.

Steps in development. The history of industry shows certain marked stages. Those stages are the result of great revolutionary discoveries in regard to nature. It is not to be assumed that these stages follow each other in the same orderly way in the life of every people, however; not all peoples have taken every step leading to the present, but some have, through imitation of more advanced peoples, or through the character of their physical environment, omitted intermediate stages. Yet the vital discoveries in regard to nature have been the key to the organization of industry, and

it is possible to describe these discoveries and the social life which accompanied them. Thus discoveries of nature stand out as revolutionary in the sense that customs and standards and general social organization determining the relations of people in society come to be modified because of these discoveries.

Simple savage life found the means of subsistence through hunting, fishing, and the gathering of what nature gives directly without modification. Undoubtedly man lived this life for countless ages. From it he emerged into either the pastoral or the agricultural life or a union of these two. Two discoveries are primarily responsible for this transition; each of them was revolutionary in character in the sense that it led to many and fundamental changes in the economic order as well as many changes which are not economic.

Domestication of animals. One of these discoveries is the *domestication of animals*, which is the beginning of surplus or accumulated wealth. A larger population now became possible because a larger and more certain food supply was available, as well as other forms of wealth. With the development of surplus wealth came the rise of many economic institutions which lasted for ages, and some of which have persisted to our own time. The existence of surplus wealth strengthened man's acquisitive impulses and led to the development of the institution of property: wealth was coveted for itself and for the power and the social distinction which it gave. 'Nature men' who lived by hunting had little wealth to own except their weapons and ornaments; but flocks and herds could easily be the basis of individual or family power and prestige. Hence rules and customs about ownership developed into the institution of property, still the most fundamental institution of the economic order.

The care of cattle or sheep made continuous labor necessary; a larger population could be maintained, but those who owned could free themselves from labor by utilizing the work of others. Hence arose a leisure class and a slave class. Property acquired privileges; slavery became firmly established.

A further natural development was the growth of civil law, a body of customs and regulations governing property and the relations of classes.

The character of the family in this economic order is fixed also.

Just as men saw the economic advantage of holding slaves for work, so they saw the economic advantage of large families of children to care for flocks and perform other duties. Now that a food supply was relatively secure, the advantage of a larger population for labor and also for use in defense in case of attack by other herdsmen, led to an increase in population and an increase in the power of the male head of the family. Probably vanity and pride also had to do with this development. In any case the patriarchal family, with polygamy for the well-to-do heads of families, became the usual family type. As women were often slaves, the position of woman was probably lowered and her subservience to man increased. Often, in addition, the male head became the religious representative of the family; ancestor-worship was common, and the worshiped ancestors were the departed male heads of the family; thus the power of the father was increased by religious sanction.

Here are a considerable number of permanent social institutions organized into a relatively complex social life. A society of this kind differs greatly from a scant population of fishers or hunters.

Domestication of plants. The *domestication of plants* may be called a second great revolutionary discovery: upon it rests the development of agricultural society. It is not meant to suggest that this discovery follows the former in time. Often probably they are found together, and some people, it may be, have never passed through one or the other stage. It is more usual, however, for the pastoral life to precede the settled agricultural life. In any case the knowledge of how to care for plants and seeds brought a great development in society. A larger population was possible, since a large food supply was now assured, which could be stored. Land became of increasing importance, and in time emerged as the chief form of wealth, property in land displacing property in cattle in this respect, the land-owning class becoming the ruling class.

An agricultural society tends to become a relatively stationary society. This is one of the most fundamental consequences of the change to agricultural life. Wandering and unsettled groups, even though possessed of some wealth, have not developed far toward so-called 'civilized' life. It is only as societies become settled that they acquire the characteristics which belong to developed civiliza-

tions. Kinship as a basis of social organization came often to be of less consequence, while locality or territory increased in importance; thus civil society took the place of family society, and village or manorial economy became its chief form. Agriculture makes for stability, and it increases the possibility of division of labor; therefore, in larger agricultural villages is found the beginnings of manufacturing and of exchange.

Inevitably the supreme importance of land led to the development of customs and regulation in regard to the ownership of land. Land law readily became the most important part of the civil law. Accompanying this was the fact that the relations of classes to each other came to be based upon land. A landless man, in such a society, was an outcast; he must attach himself to some landholder or suffer destruction. Slavery was likely to continue, therefore, but might change its character, if land was abundant, by assigning to the slave a piece of land in exchange for a certain amount of labor. Thus serfdom eventually appeared and became a stage toward the later wage contract. Ancestor-worship based on kinship was not so well suited to a larger village and territorial society, and so tended to give way to local religious worship.

Thus again it is evident that economic developments lead to a rearrangement of human relations and so are accompanied by changes in the structure of society as a whole.

II. The Modern Industrial Revolution

It is customary to speak of the transformation of economic life which has been taking place during the past hundred and fifty years, as the *industrial revolution*. Without doubt it is the most thorough reorganization of economic life which society has ever seen. Like the revolutionary changes which have already been described, changes in the economic life are accompanied by similar changes in political and social arrangements and by conflicts between the older customs and the newer ideas which the advance of knowledge has brought. It is impossible to appreciate or understand the many social problems of our time without first realizing the nature of this *greatest industrial revolution* which is still in process.

The mechanical phase of the industrial revolution. The first aspect and the one most easy to see is the scientific and mechanical. For two to three hundred years before the middle of the eighteenth century, there had been a gradual accumulation of scientific knowledge which was finally applied to industry. At the same time the growth of commerce between nations and the discovery of the New World created a demand for goods in new and larger markets. The result was a series of mechanical inventions which marks this new era as the age of machinery. This is the expansion of the tool as a mode of production, substituting the more complicated but fixed routine motion of the machine for the somewhat varied and uncertain adjustments of the hand tool. Mechanical inventions made possible a great increase in the amount of production. At the same time came the invention of the steam engine by which the power of nature now took the place of the weak power of the human muscle. The principle of the steam engine had been known since the days of the Greeks, but not till the latter part of the eighteenth century did such an engine become really usable in manufacture. It also was quickly applied to transportation, thereby making easy the carrying of large quantities of products to distant and central markets.

Changes in the organization of business. These are outstanding facts in the development of the machine from the tool which constitutes the mechanical aspect of the industrial revolution. Parallel with them were certain changes in the organization of business by which the products could be exchanged: such changes have to do with the growth of credit and so of banking, the organization of the corporation to carry on the complex economic activities rapidly developing, and the expansion of the system for marketing the goods produced.

Certain industrial results followed, which may be briefly summarized. The first is the building of factories; the older method by which goods were made in the home had to be given up; instead, workers were gathered in factories where there was room for machinery. The factory became a new grouping of men in industry, not devised by the workers themselves, but by those who owned the machines and engines — the *capitalists*, as they are called. Many changes in the life of workers might be expected from this

new association of many men (sometimes many thousands) in their work under the same conditions. Their organization into compact associations or unions for mutual benefit was a natural and almost inevitable consequence.

A second result is the fact of *large-scale production* for great markets. No longer are goods made by those who consume them, nor for definite persons who are to use them. They are more and more 'ready-made,' to be sold in a market for a profit, and after many exchanges to reach consumers who know nothing of the original makers nor they of him. Consequently corporations of immense size have come into existence, manufacturing and selling on an undreamed-of scale. Such corporations as the United States Steel Corporation, with a quarter of a million of employees and a capital of over a billion dollars, or the International Harvester Company, which owns its own mines, its forests, and its railways, illustrate this fact.

A third result was equally inevitable — that is, the vast increase of the world's wealth. How great is this increase it is quite impossible to say, but invention after invention has enormously multiplied man's productive power. Evidently machinery has created a far more adequate basis of living, so that apparently it should be easy to clothe, feed, and house in relative comfort the machine-using populations. The increase in the world's supply of material goods is the most immediately noticeable result of the industrial revolution.

Social consequences. Certain social consequences of these economic changes must next be stated. The first is the rapid growth of population. Changed methods of production, increasing wealth, led also to an increase of population. The industrial revolution began first in Great Britain and spread from that country to Continental Europe and gradually to the rest of the world. In Great Britain the population in 1750 is estimated to have been about 7,500,000; in 1905 it was five times that number. Similar increases of population are found wherever the machine development has taken place. In the nineteenth century the population of France increased by fifty per cent, that of Germany by three hundred per cent.

A second social consequence is a change in the relationship of social classes. Machinery and tools grew in importance as compared with the labor factor in production. Those who owned these instruments of production thereby gained enormously in social importance, becoming a compact industrial capitalist class as contrasted with those who were employed to work the machines and who became the new industrial labor class. The latter are in a different position from the older laborers, who had owned their tools and who worked largely in their own homes. The new factory laborers do not own the machines with which they work; neither do they work in their own homes. They thus became a propertyless labor class working for wages. The importance of this development is very great in relation to the conflict between labor and capital in our own day.

Another social result grows out of the close relation of economic life to other aspects of society as a whole. Changes in the methods of production begin a new era. By contrast old customs and institutions stand out and are observed, while before they were taken for granted. Criticism usually follows, together with more or less of discontent. Every age of industrial reorganization is likely, therefore, to be an age of social unrest and perhaps of disorder. This is peculiarly true of the hundred or more years which mark the period of the industrial revolution. At no time have the very foundation institutions of society been so subject to criticism, with accompanying discontent. It is this which makes it so necessary for educated men to understand the character and real problems of their life as citizens.

The redistribution of population. One other social consequence of the industrial revolution needs to be understood. This is the widespread *redistribution of population.* For a hundred years or more men have been moving over the earth in the effort to reorganize their lives in relation to the means of living. New natural resources and new ways of utilizing them, and new organization of the mechanical elements of production, call for new arrangements of men as workers and afford new opportunities for making a living. And the mechanical inventions themselves — principally the steam engine — have made this redistribution of population

easy, as it has never been before. Now it is to be specially noted that this new economic distribution of people *disregards former bases of division between groups such as race, nation, language, religion, local custom, family. The machine demands labor, but has little regard for past customs, sentiments, ideals, or beliefs.* Out of this fact grow some of the most insistent and difficult of modern social problems. New groupings are being made in our age, a new mingling of people whose language, customs, ideals, knowledge, race, are alien one to the other. Such a mingling, with their contrasts of standards and customs, is bound to lead to the decay of many institutions unless they commend themselves by their sheer merit.

The facts of the redistribution of population thus underlie much of the social activity of our age, and must be considered with some fullness. The problem of the adjustment of population to environment in the struggle to live is continuous. It is first a search for resources — those elements found in nature upon which man lives; this search is never finished or complete, since new knowledge brings into existence new resources, and new wants are forever arising which react upon the discovery of new resources. At times also distinctly new or unknown lands have been discovered. Such lands, if important in resources, at once lead to a movement of population to utilize their resources. It is for this reason that the discovery of the New World occasioned the most astounding movement of population the world has ever experienced. Coming at a time which preceded by only a relatively brief period the great inventions in the means of transportation, the New World has been the goal of countless throngs of people for many years. Wherever relatively unoccupied lands exist, the possibility of using their resources will ultimately tend to bring people to them.

Advance in knowledge is also a basis for migration or the redistribution of people. New knowledge applied to production reorganizes the working group and the relations of men to nature. Thus the invention of textile machines and the steam engine made the factory, which is a new massing of population. Factories and the warehouses for their goods, through massing labor, made the manufacturing city. Just as population has moved to new

lands, so it has moved to such new industrial groupings which are really demands for labor equivalent to new economic opportunity.

Students of population distinguish four factors in relation to its never-ending movement and adjustment. Size of population, resources, 'the stage of the arts' (that is, the system of industrial technique and knowledge), and the standard of living. A further influence thus in redistribution of population is the outgrowth of changes in the standards of living. Whatever affects or changes the motives which lead men to work and economize, and which determine for them how far they will go in this effort, may lead to migration in order to satisfy the changed standards which result. In other words, changes in the standard of living, as a mental fact only, is the suggestion of movement to sources which may realize those standards. Thus the possibility of education, or of the ownership of a farm, does not bring migration unless these ideas enter the mind and become a part of the mental standard of the people concerned.

Limitations upon the migration movement arise through isolation, opposition, and inertia. Isolation is based upon geography, lack of knowledge, and custom; each of these prevents men from moving, either through geographical inability, or lack of knowledge of the better economic possibilities, or the lack of will to break customs or natural bonds. Opposition is social in that it represents the policy of either the home society (family, tribe, nation) or the society to which immigrants would go. Thus countries have often forbidden their citizens to migrate, and other countries limit the movement to them of people of foreign lands.

In general, however, migration is primarily economic in character, and is a movement of population in relation to the known resources which supply the means of living. It is continuous, and is renewed from age to age with the progress of knowledge and the modification of custom and law. The result of migration is a constant mingling of diverse people. This involves (1) the mingling of blood by intermarriage (the fact and problem of amalgamation), and (2) the clash and modification of customs, language, ideals, and standards (the fact and problem of assimilation).

CHAPTER XXIII

MOVEMENTS OF POPULATION IN AMERICA — IMMIGRATION

THE redistribution of population in our own day and our country has two phases with problems arising from each, though they are closely interrelated. Both of these phases are found elsewhere and express the economic reorganization of the entire world following the industrial revolution. They are determined by two demands and opportunities for labor in relation to resources and technique. The first is the demand for agricultural land to be used for the production of food and raw material. The opening of new lands by the discovery of the New World and by the developments in the means of transportation has led therefore to the spread of European (and to some extent Asiatic) populations over North and South America, Australia, Africa, Siberia, and other unoccupied or relatively undeveloped parts of the world. The second phase is the demand of the machine for labor to work raw material into manufactured products, and of transportation machinery to bring to market both raw material and finished product. Hence the sweep of population to the places of manufacture and of markets — that is, the city. Out of these two phases — thoroughly intermingled — arise the kindred social problems of *immigration* and the *city movement;* each has tremendous social consequences.

Characteristics of American immigration. While immigration is a world fact, it is in the United States that it has had far the largest effect and can best be studied. It is estimated that approximately thirty-four million people have come to this country, mainly from Europe, since it became an independent nation. The census of 1920 shows that there are nearly fourteen million foreign-born white persons in the United States; and that there are twenty-two and a half million more, one or both of whose parents are foreign-born. The early population movement was largely from Great Britain, whose language, laws, customs, and characteristics were thereby organized

into the social life and ideals of this country and thus dominate and direct the currents of its national life. The countries of Northwestern Europe contributed largely to our population in succeeding years, so that the total number whose ancestry goes back to Germany is larger than that for any country except Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway, and Sweden) follow with large percentages. More recently, particularly since soon after the close of the Civil War, there have been coming large streams of immigrants from the Mediterranean countries, and from Central Europe, with smaller numbers from Asia. This new movement is often called the *new immigration*, to distinguish it from the older immigration from Western Europe, primarily because it seems to show different characteristics and qualities. Any complete statement of the immigrant population of the United States must also include the ancestors of the ten million negroes now citizens of the country. Though this was a forced immigration, and of course has long since ceased, it is a very vital and serious aspect of our immigration history.

Causes of immigration. Immigration to the United States has largely been caused by economic opportunity. The earlier half of it was directed principally to the fertile agricultural lands which were open to settlement. Though the immigrants did not always move to these lands at once, either they or those whose places they took in the towns and cities eventually were drawn by the lure of free land. Because of this fact America could become the granary of Europe, far more grain being raised than could be consumed by our own population. As soon as the new means of transportation — steamboat and railway, following turnpikes and canals — could open the way, farmlands were occupied and began to ship their product to feed the growing factory populations of England and France. Until the Civil War this was the dominant fact in our immigration history. Those who came were mainly from Great Britain (including the large numbers of Irish who were driven by famine from their own country), from Germany, and from the Scandinavian countries.

After the Civil War the United States moved rapidly toward the manufacturing stage of its development. Its factories for steel,

cotton, wool, shoes, and a great variety of other products, together with the immense development of railway building, led to the rapid growth of cities. Soon the demand for labor became more largely a demand for factory labor or for such labor as is used in building and general construction. Meanwhile ocean steamship lines had begun to connect the Atlantic seaboard with new populations in the Eastern Mediterranean and Central Europe. It is these peoples largely who have responded to this second phase of the development of the United States and its opportunity for labor. This newer immigration differs from the original English settlers more than did the earlier immigrants. Their languages, customs, religious beliefs, and general traditions are quite different, so that a long time may be needed before they become adjusted to American life. The importance of these differences is hard to estimate, and it is certainly easy to exaggerate. In any case the numbers grow surprisingly large, so that the problem of the possible assimilation of this immense throng of people of many tongues and varying traditions and history becomes a very serious one. Of New York City's five and one half million[1] almost two million are foreign-born, and over two and a quarter million more are the children of parents one or both of whom are foreign-born. Only 1,164,000 are native whites of two generations. Of Chicago's two and three quarter millions, only 642,000 are native whites of two generations, while 805,000 are foreign-born. Similar percentages are found in all the larger cities of the East and Central West.

Three aspects of the immigration problem may be briefly outlined: the racial, the economic, and the social.

Race or blood mixture through immigration. Immigration suggests the problem of the mixing of races. It should be borne in mind, however, that except for the negro forced migration and the relatively small Oriental immigration, almost the entire immigrant population belongs to the white race. The differences in blood must, therefore, not be exaggerated. While different groups differ from each other in the facts of their historic past and belong to nationalities quite distinct, these are matters of social, not natural inheritance, and do not affect the blood. We do not know that the

[1] *Fourteenth Census* (1920), vol. III.

blood of any of these people is inferior to that of others or that of the earlier American stock. The intelligence tests which were applied to the United States draft army in 1917 do, indeed, indicate that young men from the Eastern Mediterranean and Central Europe passed at a lower average than those of the native American draft population of the Northern States. But how far this shows inferiority in natural ability is not clear, particularly when the history of these people and their opportunity to understand the meaning of the tests is considered. It is clear, too, that the immigrant populations are economically very poor; it is their poverty, indeed, that makes them migrate. Undoubtedly in the mass of the extremely poor of every people is to be found a heavy proportion of low inborn intelligence, because poor intelligence itself is the greatest of handicaps in making a living. Thus, even if the tests should seem to indicate a heavy percentage of poor ability among the 'newer immigration,' it would show nothing about the stocks as a whole to which these immigrants belong.

In the nature of our history it is evident that the people of the United States is a mixed people. There is no possibility of a pure race here: probably there is no such thing as a pure race anywhere. The real blood problem here at least is not racial but individual. Our knowledge of physical and mental weakness is sufficient to make us realize that the safety of a population lies in part in the elimination of the weaker inheritance. The application of such scientific knowledge should lead us to make an examination at European ports of all intending immigrants in order to weed out those individuals who are plainly of naturally poor inheritance. If this were done, we should then have a basis of knowledge upon which to judge whether one nationality shows any distinct inferiority to another; but more important would be the fact that we should prevent the incoming of those whose inheritance of weakness is certain to be handed on into the blood stream of the American race. It should be added, however, that to some extent the immigration legislation in force works in this direction. Those who are afflicted with loathsome diseases, the distinctly feeble-minded, the insane, and those "who are likely to become a public charge" are now forbidden to come. The legislation needs to be applied, however, at

the European ports, and to be much more completely worked out from the point of view of inherited weakness.

It is very probable that the racial aspect of the immigration problem has been discussed and emphasized far more than its importance justifies. The main observable differences between the immigrant white peoples who have come to the United States are not inborn, but acquired. The real question to be studied is not that of race mixture, but that of the possibility of peoples of diverse customs and ideas becoming happily united in understanding and good-will with those already here; it is the problem of assimilation.

Economic aspects of immigration. The economic aspects of immigration are of evident importance. On the one hand, the immigrant has furnished a great labor force in the development of production in America. In large part the 'newer immigration' is unskilled in industry, and so provides the unskilled labor supply of the country. On the other hand, the continuous stream of cheap labor creates a dangerous competition with native-born labor. Poverty is the most evident and important characteristic of the stream of immigrant labor; this means a body of men who will accept low wages as well as unfavorable conditions of work; the result is a constant drag upon the effort to improve these conditions or increase wages. Organized labor is, therefore, opposed to a large immigration; many employers have favored it. Probably cheap labor has been the greatest menace to American social progress. It began its influence with the negro, and unfortunately is at least one definite and important phase of the immigration problem. The cheaper it is the less is it treated humanely; and the effect upon the employing class and upon other grades of labor is harmful, breaking down ideals of justice and humanity, and weakening the possibility of the realization of democracy. "The arrival of ever fresh multitudes," says Walter Weyl, "adds to the difficulties of securing a democratic control of either industry or politics. The presence of the unskilled, unlettered immigrant excites the cupidity of men who wish to make money quickly and do not care how. It makes an essentially kind-hearted people callous. Why save the lives of 'Wops'? What does it matter if our industry kills a few thousands more or less, when, if we wish, we can get millions a year from in-

exhaustible Europe?" [1] It is unfortunately true that, to quote Professor Fetter, "the labor supply coming from countries of denser population and with low standards of living, creates, in some occupations, an abnormally low level of wages."

It has been thought, naturally, that the admission of large bodies of immigrants must be a relief to the overcrowded populations from which they come. This, however, seems not to be the case. "Natural increase quickly fills the ranks of an impoverished peasantry," and neither is population decreased nor general conditions bettered in the countries from which our immigrants come.

Moreover, there is some reason to believe that the effect of the incoming of large numbers of workers at a low standard of living apparently is to reduce the birth rate of the older American stock. In New England in the industrial centers the native-born population is not maintaining itself, but the Italian and French-Canadian birth rate is heavy. In order to maintain his better standard of living in the face of the competition of lower-standard immigrants, the American workman restricts the size of his family. Thus the newer immigrant populations are constantly taking the place of the older stocks, through the force of economic competition.

Social aspects of immigration. The more general social aspects of immigration suggest such conditions as pauperism, crime, and education. In understanding these problems, it should always be remembered that poverty is the most evident accompaniment of immigrant life; the immigrant comes out of harsh conditions of economic life; he has had little opportunity for education; his associations have been limited and determined by the fact of the severest struggle to live; and he lands in this country with little money. All this is no indication of inherently poor quality, except in so far as a certain percentage of poverty is itself caused by a feeble-minded inheritance. But it is to be expected that in the struggle to become adjusted to a new and strange world there will be a degree of temporary failure which might show in pauperism or even crime. Inevitably the percentage of illiteracy will be low in so far as immigrants come from countries of poor educational opportunity for the mass of people. The new life is, for the immigrant,

[1] *Harper's Magazine*, vol. CXXIX, p. 621.

a place of trial and testing. To a large extent he is part of the movement from country to city life, the immigration stream being composed largely of European rural peasants, who enter American city life because for them the opportunity they seek and demand is found in the city rather than in the country. The fact of their previous poverty is a serious handicap, so that many may soon pass into the pauper, vagrant, or criminal class. Unfortunately the conditions of the city environment are far from favorable as a basis for their advancement. Though the law now prevents the incoming of those "likely to become a public charge," so that the per cent of pauperism here is greatly reduced, yet the reports of the census and of the Immigration Commission (1911) indicate still a somewhat high percentage of foreign-born in almshouses. Of the cases investigated by the Immigration Commission, the cause of their dependency in considerably over half (fifty-nine per cent) was inability to obtain employment or insufficient earnings, and in 28.7 per cent it was the death or sickness of the wage-earner of the family. These causes point to misfortune or lack of acquaintance with conditions of life or sheer shortage of demand for labor, but do not indicate inferior quality in the immigrant. It may be wise to remember also that it is among the immigrants from the Northwest of Europe that there is the heaviest percentage of poverty from neglect or bad habits of the head of the family, the Irish, Germans, and Norwegians greatly exceeding the Italians in this respect. And it is significant that of those receiving aid more than a third (33.9 per cent) had been here over twenty years, while only six per cent had been here two years or less.

In regard to immigrant crime, there has been a great deal of dispute. Two quite contrary opinions have been voiced. One asserts that the immigrant contributes heavily to the volume of crime; the other that he is not responsible for more crime than his percentage of the population would justify. Probably the truth is as stated by Jenks and Lauck, based on the work of the Immigration Commission: "Such material as is available, if trustworthy, would seem to indicate that immigrants are rather less inclined toward criminality, on the whole, than are native Americans, although these statistics do indicate that the children of immigrants commit crime more

often than the children of natives." [1] Immigrants from the different nationalities differ from each other in their crime record; Laughlin's examination of four hundred and forty-five State and Federal institutions indicates that the Balkan peoples lead in crime record, the Italians come second, and the Russians are third.[2] The heavy criminal or delinquency record of children of immigrants has been much discussed. It is probably to be explained as a consequence of the change in family control brought about by the problem of adjustment to new conditions, both in a new world and in city life. Without question it is a serious aspect of the city immigrant problem.

The record of immigrants for insanity is notably high. Though the law forbids the admission of insane, it is difficult to prevent many from coming in; the hardships and uncertainties of the period of adjustment to new conditions undoubtedly result in a high percentage of insanity. The census studies on the problem of insanity indicate that a third of the insane in hospitals are foreign-born, while the report of the Immigration Commission points to a much higher proportion.

Illiteracy is an indication of the degree of previous opportunity for education. The record for illiteracy in the United States is unfortunately very high. This is due mainly to two elements — the Southern negro and the alien immigrant. Six per cent of the entire population of the United States over ten years of age is unable to write in any language, this being the census definition of illiteracy. The per cent of negro illiteracy is 22.9, while 13.1 is that of the foreign-born. It is to be noted, however, that the immigrant illiteracy almost disappears in the second generation. Nationalities differ greatly in regard to illiteracy, the percentage among the 'new immigration' being much heavier than among the 'old.' For facts here the best source remains the *Report of the Immigration Commission*, which defined illiteracy as inability either to read or write any language. This report shows that the average illiteracy

[1] Jenks and Lauck: *The Immigration Problem*, p. 53. Funk & Wagnalls Co.

[2] See H. H. Laughlin: *Analysis of America's Modern Melting-Pot* (House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 3d Session); and also the interesting analysis of this document by H. S. Jennings, "Undesirable Americans," in *The Survey*, December 15, 1923.

of the 'new immigration' (for the ten-year period preceding 1910) was 35.8, while for the 'old immigration' it was 2.7 per cent. The importance of illiteracy is considerable in industrial and political aspects. Industrial accidents are very frequently due to inability to read and so to heed warnings and instructions; and the ease with which masses of ignorant voters unable to read can be manipulated by party bosses has long been a great source of political corruption.

On the other hand, it is fair to say that on the whole the immigrant values education for his children; while nationalities differ in this respect, and those who expect soon to return to their old country have least interest, yet the record for school attendance is high and among some races — for example, the Hebrews — is especially noteworthy.

Finally, it may be added that the tendency to be a transient immigrant — that is, to come and go with changes in labor demand, returning eventually to the country from which he came — is considerably greater among the 'new' than the 'old' immigration, though among the Hebrews from Central Europe this is notably contradicted. The temporary, even seasonal, labor demands of our modern industrial life is the evident explanation.

Immigration policy. The question of the policy to be followed by the United States in regard to immigration is of two kinds. There is, first, the question of restriction or non-restriction; and, second, is the question of assimilation and the measures to be used for this purpose. The first of these questions has occupied the attention of the country largely to the exclusion of the second, though it is now coming to be recognized that the effort to assimilate those who are legally admitted is central and must be the basis of any intelligent restriction policy.

Our restriction policy has been directed mainly toward individuals and not races, except for the case of Oriental immigration, until the present 'per cent' law. In general, and until the past few years, immigration has been encouraged, it being assumed that a labor force to develop our resources was the prime industrial need. Therefore, only individuals of recognized inferior quality were excluded by the law; such persons were and are the immoral and the criminal, the insane and feeble-minded, paupers, those having

loathsome and contagious diseases, those likely to become a public charge. To protect American labor from dangerous competition, the law forbids laborers 'under contract' to be brought in.

A change in restrictive legislation has taken place in recent years. Leading up to and following the report of the Immigration Commission in 1911 there grew a conviction that the number coming each year was too large, particularly of those from Eastern and Central Europe. In 1907, 1,285,349 immigrants were admitted in one year, and in 1910, 1913, and 1914 the numbers were over a million each. The Immigration Commission concluded that immigration was bringing an oversupply of unskilled labor, and was increasing unemployment in the United States. This state of mind became more intense following the War, hostility to large incoming numbers becoming more pronounced. Two additional laws are the result. The law of 1917, now in force, usually called the 'literacy test,' refuses admission to those over sixteen years of age who cannot read some language, it being thought that this will exclude large numbers of the unskilled immigrants. It is too soon to know whether it will have this effect or not, but at present it seems doubtful. In 1921 the 'three per cent' law was passed as a temporary emergency act, and was reënacted in 1922. This law permitted entrance to three per cent only per year of the number of the foreign-born of any nationality in the United States as determined by the Census of 1910. Somewhat less than 360,000 is the total number which this ratio would annually admit, thus reducing greatly the possible numbers as compared with many years before the War. The effect, too, was to limit the quota of immigrants from Eastern and Southern rather than from Western Europe. In June, 1924, the quota was changed from three per cent to two per cent as based on the Census of 1890 instead of 1910. This will result in a greater reduction in the total number to be admitted and will weigh more heavily upon the immigrants from the East and South of Europe. It should be added that this law does not make any additional effort to improve or modify the selection within the quota of any nationality.[1]

[1] For an admirable statement and criticism of the law see Howard Woolston, in *Journal of Social Forces*, vol. II, No. 5, p. 666.

Thus it is clear that the restrictions placed upon admission of immigrants apply first to undesirable individuals, and are selective in character. The recent legislation aims really at limitation of numbers, but in effect is to some extent also selective as regards nationalities. The laws in regard to the Chinese and Japanese (see Chapter XVI) and the 'barred zone' are the only laws restricting by race. More careful restriction of individuals by test of native ability is still to be desired as a part of a scientific policy.

The assimilation question — Relation to industry. A restriction policy evidently is related to the question of assimilation. Assimilation is a mental term referring to an approach toward unity in understanding, sentiment, sympathy, and standards. Every people appreciates the fact and need of unity; but immigrants bring with them ways which separate them from the people of the country to which they come. It is desirable that immigrants should become adjusted to the life they enter in the new country as soon as possible, since marked differences in their views and customs tend to develop and intensify hostility and intolerance. It is common for the native-born to believe that immigrants 'cannot be assimilated.' This is usually an expression only of consciousness of difference; and all that we know through experience points to the probability of assimilation of any people if time enough is allowed and if the social conditions are favorable. Assimilation depends upon favorable contacts between groups, and the rapidity of assimilation is conditioned by these contacts. By 'favorable contacts' is meant the social attitude of the native-born toward the immigrant, the degree of economic opportunity open to him, the educational activities which are presented to him and which he is able to receive, and the hopefulness which the new life arouses in him. Such contacts depend upon organized social effort and make necessary an examination of the nature and quality of American society itself. Since the immigrant comes to this country largely because of the hope of economic betterment, the prime factor in his assimilation is the industrial life itself. Unfortunately, the crowded city slum life, together with the too common idea that the immigrant is cheap and can be exploited, does not make for him a favorable approach to the better life of America. Bad housing, low wages, unemploy-

ment, and mistreatment tend to arouse opposition and discontent, so that reasonable assimilation proceeds slowly. The fact that the immigrant is a stranger as well as poor has made it easy to exploit him, and this has been done in manifold ways. If assimilation is to proceed at all well, there should be developed laws and organized agencies for his protection until a reasonable degree of adjustment to the new conditions of living has taken place. The work of the California Commission of Housing and Immigration is a good illustration of what may wisely be done in this way. It is actively interested in the protection of the immigrant against abuse, deceit, and exploitation; it sets standards which control housing, particularly in labor camps; in coöperation with the State school authorities, it endeavors to bring educational opportunity to the immigrant so that he may become adjusted quickly. Life histories told by different immigrants in which each has recounted his experiences and struggles are full of the illustration of the unfortunate conflict with suspicion, deceit, and evil conditions as well as the more ordinary and expected difficulties of adjustment to the life of a new world. The autobiographies of Panunzio, Ramage, and Steiner are illuminating evidence of the need of the organization of adequate protective agencies for immigrants in order that assimilation may take place on a wholesome plane.

Immigrant colonies. Among the further serious difficulties in the way of assimilation is the fact of immigrant segregation in large city colonies. 'Little Italy,' 'Little Poland,' 'Little Bohemia' and other similar foreign sections found in many cities of America, represent a tendency to crowd immigrant life into groups which are out of contact with American life and institutions. Here are usually found the worst living conditions in the city, harsher in many respects than the immigrant has been used to in his own country. Only his native language is here spoken, newspapers in his native tongue serve his desire for news if he can read, and organizations — economic, religious, and fraternal — belong to his own people. It is inevitable that this should retard his assimilation to American life. But it is important to add that there is a constant stream out from each of such colonies into other sections of the city and other places altogether, which is evidence that the

colony does not prevent, but only retards, the distribution of immigrants into the general population. The race or nationality prejudice of Americans itself is an element in preventing a better and quicker distribution, showing itself in hostility against immigrants moving into non-immigrant neighborhoods.

Agencies of assimilation. The most important agencies for immigrant assimilation (aside from the fact of living directly among native Americans) now at work are the public school and the industrial employment of labor, together with membership in unions. In the school there is the opportunity to learn English quickly (and the lack of ability to use English is one of the most serious barriers to assimilation, in the early years of the immigrant's residence). The opportunity is found also to impress upon growing minds something of the history, the traditions, and the better standards of American life. Assimilation, therefore, takes place rapidly among the children who attend school. Of immigrant nationalities, the Hebrew and the Germans stand out as appreciative of schools for their children, a fact which is evidenced by the percentage of children of these peoples in school. 'The job' in which a worker is employed is an important assimilative agency in so far as he is in contact with others than his own race. Competition drives him to learn quickly the ways and methods of the new life. If in addition he becomes a member of a labor union, he is brought into touch with the points of view and the methods of procedure which the industrial activity in America has evolved. To hear discussions and perhaps to take part in them, to understand the use of rules of order and parliamentary procedure, to recognize the coöperative character of labor organization and the problems of industry involved, are educative experiences of a stimulating sort; they quicken his ability to take care of himself in the new environment — an important result to be desired.

Levels of assimilation. Whether it is possible to bring about better distribution of immigrants through governmental action is a question much discussed but difficult to answer. Some method by which the 'colony' could be broken up or reduced in size seems very much to be desired, but the evil of the colony system is quite as much the bad housing and inferior facilities for living and edu-

cation as it is the fact that assimilation is slow. Assimilation is not merely rapid or slow; it may take place also at low or high levels. When it takes place on a low level, the result is assimilation, not with the best in American life, but its worst, for our society itself is not a unit in ideals and standards of knowledge or behavior. It is fair to say, therefore, that the aim in our efforts in regard to assimilation should be to make for the immigrant favorable contacts resting upon the organization of suitable conditions of industry, of education, and of living.

Meanwhile it must be recognized that the presence of a large and growing body of unassimilated foreigners, characterized primarily by extreme poverty, and representing many diverse languages, customs, standards, and education, makes a serious problem of social organization, quite different and far more complex than the earlier immigration problem.

We have teeming polyglot slums, and the clash of race with race in sweatshop and factory, mine and lumber camp. We have a mixture of ideals, a confusion of standards, a conglomeration of clashing views on life.... America to-day is in transition. We have moved rapidly from one industrial world to another, and this progress has been aided and stimulated by immigration. The psychological change, however, which should have kept pace with this industrial transformation has been slower and less complete. It has been retarded by the very rapidity of our immigration. The immigrant is a challenge to our highest idealism, but the task of Americanizing the extra millions of newcomers has hindered progress in the task of democratizing America.[1]

READING REFERENCES

Chapin, F. S.: *Social Economy*, chs. XIII to XVI. (The entire volume is suggestive.)
Chapin, F. S.: *Social Evolution*, ch. IX.
Ely, R. T.: *Evolution of Industrial Society.*
Abbott, F. F.: *The Common People of Ancient Rome.*
Bücher, C.: *Industrial Evolution.*
Cheney, E. P.: *Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chs. I, II, and IV.
Hamilton, W. H.: *Current Economic Problems*, sections 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32.
Fairchild, H. P.: *Applied Sociology*, chs. IV to VIII.
Hobson, J. A.: *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, chs. I, II, and IV.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, chs. XXV to XXX.

[1] Walter E. Weyl, in *Harper's Magazine*, vol. CXXIX, p. 620.

Watkins, G. S.: *Introduction to the Study of Labor Problems*, chs. II and III.
Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology*, ch. XIV.

Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, ch. XXI.
Commons, J. R.: *Races and Immigrants in America.*
Drachsler, J.: *Democracy and Assimilation.*
Fairchild, H. P.: *Immigration.*
Jenks, J. W., and Lauck, W. J.: *The Immigration Problem*, 5th edition.
Abbott, G.: *The Immigrant and the Community.*
Balch, E. A.: *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens.*
Park, R. E.: and Miller, H. A.: *Old World Traits Transplanted.*
Park, R. E.: *The Immigrant Press and its Control.*
Gavit, J. P.: *Americans by Choice.*
Leiserson, W. M.: *Adjusting Immigrant and Industry.*
Ross, E. A.: *The Old World in the New.*
Steiner, E. A.: *The Immigrant Tide.*
Steiner, E. A.: *On the Trail of the Immigrant.*
Wells, H. G.: *The Future in America*, ch. IX.
Wolfe, A. B.: *Readings in Social Problems*, pp. 242–422.

QUESTIONS

1. Outline the chief factors in the industrial revolution. List the main changes which have followed it. (Compare the list in Ross: *Outlines of Sociology*, p. 364.)
2. How do the tools or mechanisms of production affect the economic relations between individuals? Compare a factory with production by hand tools.
3. What kind of things are owned? Does it depend upon the stage of industrial development?
4. Why are slavery and a leisure class more characteristic of a pastoral people than a hunting or fishing people?
5. Under what type of economic life and society did land law become the most important body of law? Why?
6. Why is an important change in the technical methods of making a living followed by a redistribution of population?
7. What is the effect of such redistribution on customs and institutions? Gather illustrations from American immigration history. Read the biography of one or more immigrants.
8. Follow in imagination the life of a single individual who leaves one people and their life and becomes a member of another. What changes take place in his habits, ideas, self-expression, etc.? Then assume that it is a people instead of an individual, and describe the kind of probable changes in its life. What changes took place when the Anglo-Saxon tribes moved into England (Britain)? When the Moors entered Spain? When the Hebrew people settled in Palestine? When the Greeks spread over the ancient Persia? Does contact of culture have to do with an understanding of the American immigration problem? What do you understand by 'assimilation,' in the discussion of immigration?

9. In what degree if any is American immigration a problem of race? If restrictive legislation were to be based on the idea of race, what ought we to know about races?
10. Does sentiment in America about immigration illustrate 'crowd' mental action or thoughtful and intelligent judgment? (Test this by asking people around you what they think about immigration, and finding what has led to their opinion.)
11. What is the position of organized labor in regard to restriction of immigration and why? The position of large employers of labor?
12. Has immigrant legislation in the United States been directed more to the problem of restriction or of assimilation?
13. Immigration has been defined as a movement of population for the purpose of effecting a balance between population and resources. Is the effect upon the country *from which* population moves such as to relieve economic pressure and raise the standard of living?

CHAPTER XXIV

REDISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION — COUNTRY AND CITY

In discussing the immigration question the effort has been to relate it closely to the industrial revolution. The spread of European population over American land first made possible a division of labor by which England could quickly and easily become a manufacturing nation, drawing her food and her cotton from the New World and sending manufactured goods in exchange. In spite of all England's new mechanical inventions, this change would not have been possible without the coöperation of the New World resources. As time passed, however, America herself became a manufacturing nation, and then the demand for labor became a different one; not primarily for farm labor, but for labor in industry — on the railways, in the construction of engineering enterprises, in the building of cities, and in the manufacturing of goods. Into these new undertakings, made by the industrial revolution as it reached the United States, streamed labor from our own farms and also from European farms. The Italian peasant, the semi-serf from the Austrian Empire or from Russia jostled the American farm boy on the city streets and worked beside him on the railroad or in the factory.

Thus immigration and the building of cities are two distinct yet closely interrelated aspects of the industrial revolution. The reorganization of industry is the fundamental social fact of our age, and it is making a thorough and vital intermingling of people in all parts of the world, but markedly so in America.

The growth of cities. The building of cities is a distinctly modern phenomenon. There were, indeed, cities in earlier civilizations, but they represented but a fraction of the people, and were the outgrowth, largely, of a commerce based upon an agricultural and rural society. Modern cities are the product of the new building of wealth through machinery and the rapid expansion of machine transportation. Western society is rapidly becoming a society of cities with a background of agriculture, and all over the world, both

East and West, the growth of city life is the dominant social fact of our times. A few facts are enough to show this trend.

In 1800, Paris was a city of half a million; in 1900, it had three millions. Eighty per cent of the population of England, Scotland, and Wales lives in cities. In 1800, London's population was somewhat over eight hundred thousand; in 1910, Greater London had a population of nearly seven millions. In a century Berlin has grown from a city of two hundred thousand to two millions. Over sixty per cent of the German population is urban. The first census of the United States in 1790 shows a population of between three and four millions, of which only three per cent lived in cities of eight thousand or more inhabitants. In 1920, a little over fifty per cent of the total population of the United States lived in places of twenty-five hundred or more. Until the nineteenth century the great mass of the people of every country was engaged in agriculture; today the proportion which is engaged in city activities grows larger every year. In 1920, the actual farm population of the United States was 31,614,269, which was only three tenths of the entire population. If towns and villages of less than twenty-five hundred be included in the "rural population," still the total is less than half the population of the United States. From the report of the Census Bureau we learn that

> Of the 105,683,108 persons enumerated in the fourteenth census (1920) 54,816,200, or 51.9 per cent, are living in incorporated places of 2500 inhabitants or more, and 50,866,899, or 48.1 per cent, in rural territory. The increase since 1910 in the population as a whole was 14.9 per cent, but during the decade there has been an increase in that portion of the population living in urban territory of 12,192,826, or 28.6 per cent, and in that portion living in rural territory of 1,518,016, or only 3.1 per cent; and if the comparison is extended to cover the two classes of rural territory, it appears that that portion living in incorporated places of less than 2500 inhabitants shows an increase of 1,745,371, or 21.5 per cent, whereas that portion living in purely country districts shows an actual decrease of 227,355, or six tenths of one per cent.

Not merely, therefore, has there been a great increase in total populations in the countries of the world during the past hundred years, but a thorough redistribution has taken place, with a constant diminution of those engaged in agriculture and a rapid growth in industrial life and in cities as the organizing basis of industry.

Causes of city growth. The causes of this remarkable redistribution of population are primarily economic. The development of machine production works in two directions. It concentrates workers about manufacturing machines and the distribution of their products. It also brings about the production of raw material and of food with fewer laborers. The introduction of machinery upon the farm has tended to replace hand methods in agriculture, and this is proceeding rapidly. Machinery makes it possible to produce agricultural goods on a larger scale under single control, but the initial cost is heavy. Hence a tendency to increase the size of farm undertakings, on the one hand, and the increasing difficulty for men without capital to become farm-owners. Thus young men and women leave the farm partly because the demand for their labor has been reduced by the use of machinery and partly because the necessary capital is lacking with which to buy land and equipment.

The human wants which are satisfied by agriculture are relatively non-elastic; they do not grow with the increase of opportunity to satisfy them. But the wants reached by city production are manifold and elastic, so that new types and kinds of manufacturing are constantly being added to those already in use. The result is that the demand for labor in the city is unlimited, while the opportunity for labor in agriculture grows but little, except as total populations grow. The effect on labor of machinery on the farm is suggested in the report of the Census of 1920 to the effect that the value of "farm implements and machinery" was three times as great as in 1910, five times as great as in 1900, and seven times as great as in 1890. Professor Hibbard cites the development of the plough as illustrating the effect of machinery upon agriculture. A yoke of oxen with a walking plough and requiring two men, ploughed from one to two acres a day. A four-horse gang plough driven by one man ploughs five acres; while a tractor plough has ploughed as much as forty acres a day.

The results of the city movement are thus of two sorts: there are the problems of the city itself, and there are also the resulting rural conditions. Consider the latter first.

I. Rural Life and its Problems

Modern science and increased capital used in agriculture. More machines, a costlier equipment, higher prices for land — these are the beginning and basis of the scattering of rural population. Moreover, agriculture has become a far more scientific and technical occupation, as knowledge of chemistry, physics, botany, and zoölogy has been applied to the problems of crop and animal culture. He who would succeed in agriculture must have some scientific knowledge and must know how to use it. Besides all this, farming is a business as well as a growing of crops; the matured product must be sold and at a profit. Often the goods are perishable; always they are seasonal, and involve a long period of expense without income until the sale is made. And the very thinning of population which follows the greater use of capital makes it difficult to obtain necessary labor at those seasons when labor is found to be necessary.

Agricultural economic problems. It is apparent that the spread of capitalism into agriculture thus is changing the agricultural life, and makes it necessary that there should be a reorganization of rural economic institutions to meet the new situation. Critical economic rural problems to-day are those of *market conditions*, *farm labor*, and *land-ownership*. The possibility of improvement in the *marketing of crops* lies in coöperation between producers; and in the long run this will be found to be the beginning of the needed reorganization of the rural community. The number of sellers of farm goods is so great and the goods are so perishable that unrestricted competition between them leads inevitably to prices too low to pay for production. It is undoubtedly true that the prices of farm products have tended toward a lower level than the prices of any other important class of goods. It has been well said that "the drift to the city is not because the city is crowded. It is due to an unintelligent rural policy. The evil is largely in the instability and the meagerness of farm profits." Probably the most effective way to remedy this is through the coöperation of farmers in marketing their products, and unless in this or some other way farmers can receive better prices for their products, the movement of population away from agriculture is likely to continue.

The *farm-labor* problem is many-sided. Older agriculture tended to use the labor of the family. This continues to-day, but in the United States large-scale farming, with its demand at special seasons for much additional labor, has led to the existence of a roving class of laborers who migrate from the city to the country or who follow harvest demands from one climate to another. This labor has no direct interest in rural life; it does not belong to the community or neighborhood; it does not expect to pass from the status of labor to that of the operation of a farm. A more permanent body of labor is much to be desired, but the conditions under which labor lives, the seasonal character of the demand for it, and the relatively low rate of wages paid, prevent the growth of a better labor supply. It is probably impossible to meet this problem thoroughly except in connection with plans to improve the conditions of farm-ownership. One of the unfortunate results of the present unsatisfactory labor supply is that it tends to place a premium upon the use of family child labor. Farm work has the possibility of great educative value to children, but without careful control in their interest it easily becomes a ruinous burden from which they are eager to escape. The scarcity of wage-labor also lends itself to the overwork of women. Without question the heaviest burdens of farm life are borne by the women; to introduce labor-saving machinery into woman's work in the same way in which it has come to be used in the general agricultural work is one of the most necessary changes, results of which might tend to modify the desertion of the farm by its present population.

The *ownership* of farms by those who operate them is much to be desired from the point of view of general public policy. The farm as a home, the ownership of which rests in the occupying family, is an ideal which has recommended itself to social students in all countries. National policies have been built upon the belief that a vigorous and independent nation can arise only from a home-owning farming population. More than any other single ideal has it been the motive which has led men and women to endure the discipline of severe and unending toil, the hardships and uncertainties of meager resources, and the loneliness of the isolated farmstead. In America it is this hope of owning their own farm home which has

populated our prairies and opened to settled life the hitherto untraveled forest lands.

Unfortunately, conditions have developed which indicate that this motive of ownership is being defeated. For some decades students of rural life have observed with apprehension the continual increase of tenant-farming in the United States. In 1880, twenty-five per cent of the farms were operated by tenants; in 1910, thirty-seven per cent were tenant-farmed. Free land, which made farm-ownership easy, has disappeared; the price of land has risen, and much is not for sale at any price. A system of absentee-landlordism has extended itself over immense tracts of valuable farmlands, the owners living in cities and drawing their yearly rentals from their lands through an agent, much as in early days English landlords received rents from Irish tenants or French nobles from peasant occupiers. The investment in land for the sake of profit has led also to consolidation of immense holdings by single owners. If the usual terms of tenancy were for a long period of years and gave the tenant the right to remuneration for all improvements which he places upon the land, the condition would be less serious.

If in addition to the high cost of land, it be recalled that modern methods of machine operation call for considerable capital also, it becomes easy to understand the existence of the steady stream of young men and women moving from the farm to the city. Yet the need of the world for food and raw material, and the value and wholesomeness of the rural home life for the Nation, make this a problem of grave social concern. Evidently some modification in the nature of farm-ownership is desirable. Closely coöperating farm communities may do much in the way of common or joint ownership and use of machinery, community supplying of scientific knowledge in the shape of expert advisers, and community coöperation in obtaining the necessary credit for young farmers without means to begin the ownership of a farm. Something of this kind is being attempted by the State of California, the State providing the land, supplying the capital, equipment, and the expert advisers, the owner paying for his farm by annual payments at a low rate of interest covering a long period of years.

Other suggestions demand that the right of ownership be restricted to those who operate the land, it being held that ownership of land is an institution which must meet the test of service to society. It is evident also that, by increasing taxation upon unoccupied land, whatever land is now held for speculation would be sold and would afford for a time an increase in available farms. It may be wise to limit the size of holdings by direct legislation, as in New Zealand, or by progressive increase of taxation upon larger estates.

The economic conditions of farm life indicate that revolutionary changes are taking place. The drift to the city is in part inevitable; but it may easily be carried too far for social welfare. The conditions cannot be bettered by individuals; they call for public interest and understanding. Without some modification there is danger of a rural tenant peasantry supplanting altogether the independent farm-owning population which has been the basis of much of the best life of America.

Social aspects of rural life. Social aspects of rural life unite with and add to the economic tendencies which have been described. The thinning of rural population by the application of machinery and capitalistic methods to agriculture demands a reorganization of rural community life. *Isolation* is the basis of the social backwardness of the country; it leads to mental stagnation and suspicion; it prevents coöperation for social welfare, and is the cause of inefficiency. Rural community organization to develop the consciousness of common interests and needs, and to build stimulative social contacts between the scattered members of the common life, is the foundation on which improvement must rest.

At the present time rural *education* is far behind the education of the city. The report of a Commission of the National Education Association in 1918 says, "There are no fewer than five million rural children in the United States whose teachers have not passed the age of twenty-one . . . tens of thousands of these teachers are only sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen years old." These teachers have had "as preparation for their responsible work not more than one, two, or rarely three or four years of education beyond the eighth grade of the common school." [1]

[1] The *Report* of the State Department of West Virginia for 1919–20 states that

Comparing the educational opportunities of rural and city children, the same report says, "The term of schooling of the country school child is from one to three months shorter each year, and from two to three years shorter in its entirety," than that of the city child; "yet one half of the Nation's children are enrolled in rural and village schools."

In a census of a small rural community in the Middle West described by Wayne C. Williams,[1] the effort was made to discover why so many families had moved away to the city. "Investigation showed," says Mr. Williams, "that in every instance the prime reason for going was a desire to give the children an education." "The village which serves this community has not changed in size of population in fifty years; the older families no longer find their amusements there and are rarely seen in it; the church is dying, almost abandoned; all the families report that their children do not care to stay on the farm, but wish to get into some business or profession and live 'in town.' There is practically *no community feeling, entertainment, or responsibility.*" Illiteracy is higher in rural than city communities. Shorter school terms, more poorly prepared teachers, inferior equipment are serious aspects of rural educational life.

Rural *health* conditions are not so good as those of the better managed cities. It has been estimated that in 1800 the rural death rate was 15.2, while the city death rate was 22.1, in so far as these facts were then reported. "By 1913 the rural rate had fallen to 12.7 and the city rate to 15. That is, the rural rate had decreased by 2.5 points, but the city rate had fallen by 7.1 points." Health studies of special regions show that rural children have a higher per cent of defects of the sense organs, of nasal and throat passages, and also show greater malnutrition than do city children. Certain diseases are commonly known as rural diseases because of their prevalence in the country; such are typhoid, dysentery, and malaria. The more remote and isolated the rural settlement, the higher seems

44.4 per cent of the teachers of the State have had "*only an elementary-school education.*" These teachers are largely in country schools. (Quoted in *Rural Child Welfare*, National Child Labor Committee, p. 126.) See also Brim, O. G.: *Rural Education*, Introduction by Mabel Carney.

[1] See *The Survey*, August 15, 1922, p. 609.

to be the sickness and death rate. In such regions, out of reach of medical aid, reliance is placed on mail-order patent medicines; ignorance of health and sanitation is great. Poor cooking, unsanitary surroundings, flies as disease-bearers, no nurses, doctors, or hospitals, are among the causes which account for the spread of sickness and death.

Possibilities of social betterment. Just as isolation is the basis of the weakness and inferiority of rural life, so organization is the key to its improvement. Rural community organization, in addition to economic betterment already discussed, must be directed primarily toward *education* and *health*. On the side of education it is evident that the separate one-room school is inadequate, though in many regions it must be continued for a long time to come. With better roads is coming the possibility of consolidation of several districts into one, and the organization of a rural high school. These changes give the opportunity to employ better-trained teachers and to provide books and other equipment. A school curriculum which uses the nature background of rural life, far more than is yet usual, is another important change which is much to be desired. It seems, indeed, possible (and examples are even now to be found) that rural consolidated high schools, utilizing the nature-laboratory about them, and emphasizing the vocational studies which are helpful to farming as an occupation, may in time become the center of rural community life for adults as well as youth. In addition to the improved school, the library as an educational agency should be more widely used. Traveling libraries are now found in many regions, and even better is the county library system which establishes a central depot from which are circulated assortments of books to every village and farm home as they are desired. In general it must be said that there can be no doubt that the intellectual life of the rural world must be ministered to by far better agencies if a desirable rural society is to be maintained.

The possibility of the betterment of rural health points to the need of the organization of "health centers." Probably the county is, as a rule, the area best suited for the purpose, except in populous regions. A hospital center, a dispensary, trained nurses for hospital cases and also for visiting rural homes — these are the ele-

ments of health service which are the minimum essentials of such a plan. The heavy death rate of mothers in childbirth in the rural regions is an indication both of the sheer lack of needed medical service and the family ignorance which points to the need of health education.

Summary. Evidently both general and special education, as well as the betterment of health, are problems which cannot be met by individual effort alone. They are not being met, either, by the older and somewhat stagnant institutions of rural life. To modify these institutions or to build new ones is a work for the community itself — either the village or rural neighborhood or the county — and at times perhaps the larger community of the State or Nation must coöperate with these smaller units. Community coöperation for community needs builds community consciousness, at the same time that it leads to an understanding of the problems that are to be met and breaks down the barriers of outworn customs or prejudice. A united community church, representing and organizing the ideal interests, an enlarged community school, standing for educational, recreational, and general social interests, a health center organizing the public knowledge and the building of community health, a coöperative economic organization of the business activities of the farm life of the community — these kinds of organized community effort suggest the lines which must be followed if the values of rural environment for the building of vigor and character are to be preserved for American life. The vital primary groups of family and neighborhood, with their possibilities of development of the fundamental virtues of social life, originated in agricultural life and still find their best chance of activity and survival there. The health-giving invigoration of the outdoor life and the educational stimulation of close contact with the world of nature are there also as precious possibilities. It can be only a blind society which will carelessly let go these fundamental social values.

II. The City and its Life

As rural population lessens its rate of increase or actually in some sections decreases in number, cities grow in both number and size. Moreover, it seems that the large cities draw from the smaller and

the smaller from those next below them in size. Apparently the concentration of industry is at the expense, not only of the rural life, but of the villages and smaller towns. As one writer says, "The villages are drying up, the smaller towns are but barely maintaining their size, while the cities are expanding, and somewhat in the ratio of their sizes."

Inevitably, the rapid growth of cities, creating a new type of community with an increasingly complex social life, has brought new problems. Not until after cities have grown and manifold difficulties have plainly asserted themselves have men observed them and begun to think about them, asking themselves how the evils may be bettered.

City characteristics. The city is a society of a special kind. While each city has characteristics of its own, there are general social features which belong to all cities. Such, for example, are the congestion of population, the variety of mental contacts and resulting new ideas. Cities are places of stimulation: the gathering of products from every part of the world and the spectacular brilliance of the city street are partly the basis and partly the symbol of the stimulation of mind that shows itself in the new ideas, the discoveries, the achievements in art and science which are the product chiefly of city society. Wealth, too, is concentrated in the city. Cities are the centers of the financial organization of the world's industry and its markets; and with its control of wealth the city is also the holder of power, the organizer and dominator of societies and the lives of men. Wealth, power, luxury, refinement, education, achievement in science and art; — but over against these characteristics the city is the home of poverty, crime, and vicious living; these and other conditions of degeneration are found here more markedly than in rural life.

The populations of cities are far from homogeneous. Gathered as they are from many sources, they bring with them ideas and traditions of many and divergent kinds. It is easy, therefore, for many distinct groups to exist side by side whose differences may become more and more marked if economic or class lines separate them as well as different origins. It is easy, too, for the individual to drift along the currents of city life; the young man or woman,

coming from a rural neighborhood where each is known to all, is more or less under the control of the traditions and standards of the neighborhood. But in coming to the city, where every variety of standard is found, it becomes easy for him to fall away from the judgments and principles built about him by the family and neighborhood, and perhaps to sink to lower levels of life. This is the effect of what has been called the 'anonymous' quality of city environment. On the other hand, many a youth in leaving the country for the city has passed from a narrow and empty life into a stimulating, invigorating social atmosphere which has been for him the birth of a more vigorous manhood and a wider social intelligence.

Neglect of city-planning. In the earlier days of the industrial revolution, when factories began the massing of men in cities, it was quite unrecognized that a city meant a distinct type of community. There was no realization of the fact that it would be wise to plan the conditions of growth of this community. In these cities wealth was growing with enormous rapidity, but the idea that the community in which wealth was being created might wisely use this wealth in part for the creating of good and wholesome conditions of living was hardly dreamed of. Therefore congestion of the worst sort characterized city life. Unfit housing and disease-breeding tenements, streets unlighted and without sewerage, contaminated water, extraordinary poverty and neglect, crime, and corrupt and inefficient government, all were associated with city life and were assumed by many to be its inevitable accompaniments. In more recent times, however, a new view has begun to assert itself: it is that the more compact the population the greater is the need of coöperation. Communities need planning, and the highest order of planning is needed where there is the greatest specialization. As compared with rural life, the city represents a highly specialized life — manifold occupations, each depending on the other, varied conditions of health and of education, of wealth, of interest, but all bound together in a common life. The most important aspect of the city problem is to learn how wisely to work together and so to live together.

City community problems, it is being realized, cannot be solved by individual action. Nowhere is the term 'public' so much a real-

ity; 'public health' is health built by the public — that is, by community action; 'public education' is education which the community cares for. The beginning of the betterment of city life lies, therefore, in the appreciation of *community responsibility for community welfare.* It is the isolated individualist or the immigrant from a scattered rural population who is most likely to object to community regulations for its own welfare where these regulations seem to interfere with his wishes or his previous habits.

Special city problems and community responsibility. Certain social problems stand out as illustrating the difficulties of city organization. In each case they demonstrate the futility of leaving them to the individual to handle as he pleases. A society is an organized unit; a city-society is a very complex organized unit; the welfare of each depends upon the behavior of others; only by intelligent community coöperation can disaster be turned into vigor and strength. Problems of this character which will be briefly discussed are housing, health, and recreation.

City housing. The housing of a city population is a problem which is at the very heart of city life. Cities are places where work is done, but they are also places in which to live. Unfortunately, the providing of decent and wholesome living conditions is beyond the ability of a considerable per cent of city populations. Theoretically, the house is the basis of family life, and home-ownership might be looked for as a natural and usual method of providing for it. But in practice a relatively small per cent of city houses are owned by the families which occupy them. On the contrary, the commercial principle — that is, the expectation of profit — is the motive which directs the building and the management of the majority of houses.

The family home is believed by a majority of thoughtful people to be fundamental to a wholesome society. Without question the place in which such a home is established has much to do with the condition of the family life itself. Health and physical vigor are quite dependent upon light, air, and sanitary appliances. A reasonable amount of room is essential also to privacy, which is necessary to morals. Family recreation, too, is impossible in overcrowded living quarters. City 'slums' are essentially places of bad

housing, whether the housing be in the form of many-storied tenements or of old and remade mansions, reflecting the departed glory of former well-to-do residents who have moved to newer sections of the city. A survey of the life of any city always reveals the fact that wherever population is massed in overcrowded living quarters, there the death rate and the sickness rate is highest, and there is to be found a larger per cent of juvenile delinquency and those other similar conditions which point to the failure of the family to do its vitally important work for society.

The housing ideal seems to be a separate house for each family, with adequate space for privacy within, and for recreation, a garden, and some natural beauty without. Over against this ideal, the tendency of cities is toward multiple-family dwellings, often of many stories, close together and without grounds or "yard." As land increases in value, the tendency also is to make the apartments smaller, at the same time that rent advances. Thus it is evident that bad housing results from overcrowding, either through the massing of too big a population on a given land area or of too many people for the room space provided. In both cases the situation is aggravated by bad construction from the point of view of light, air, safety, and sanitary needs and decencies.

It is unfortunate that the victims of bad housing in the first instance are the great wage-earning groups. It would mean much for the social welfare of any city if it were to adopt measures to make home-owning easy for its 'working classes,' if only that a larger proportion of them than at present might thereby become more definitely conscious of the community life as their own. But aside from the fact that the demands of industry tend to move labor from place to place as jobs arise and then are discontinued, the chief causes of bad housing are found in poor income and the domination of profit — that is, the commercial rather than the social viewpoint — in their construction. The term 'bad housing' refers simply to the fact that there are too few suitable houses at a price which the poorer population can pay. As population is massed, the rent of land tends to increase. The fact that workers must either live near to their place of work, or where they are readily accessible to it by cheap transportation, indicates also the close connection

between the problems of city housing and of transportation. A far-sighted policy in regard to the welfare of its people would recognize these closely related problems. Bad housing is responsible for much of the sickness and misery in the life of the people; high rents resulting from the demand for city land cannot be met by the small incomes of wage-earners without overcrowding and its consequences; very cheap and quick transportation might scatter workers into suburbs where rents are lower and housing could be more ample; for this purpose community action is necessary both in regard to the control of transportation and to make good and reasonably priced housing possible in regions not too far from work centers.

As a remedy for bad housing, cities have tended in modern times to develop a 'housing code' containing building regulations in regard to light, air, sanitation, fire safety, and other features of construction. These building standards are essential as a minimum basis of safety and welfare. They are, however, merely limitations upon kinds of construction, and do not meet the economic difficulties in the housing problem.

A number of European cities have tried to encourage home-building by financial measures, as by exemption of new buildings from taxation for a period of years, or by direct loans at low interest to individuals or building associations. These efforts are a definite recognition that it is impossible to meet the evils of city housing except through a community policy which will make housing both suitable and cheap.

Certain German cities have purchased tracts of land, laid them out as districts, and built houses which they have either sold or which they rent at low prices. As a rule the surrounding regions have been a part of the original purchase, so that, as the improvement of one district has increased the value of the adjacent land, this increased value has belonged to the city itself.

The policy of community-owned districts and city construction of housing for its people may take the form of so-called 'garden cities.' These represent an effort to provide both useful and beautiful living conditions, healthful and convenient in all respects, and yet at reasonable rents for working-class populations. In these favored places death rates and sickness rates have been greatly re-

duced; space for recreation, beauty of construction, a careful architectural and landscape plan for the entire garden city, not only have brought valuable results in improved health, but have given the opportunity for a happier and more normal social life. These are prime values and must in the end take precedence over private profit.

To summarize, it may be said that building regulations are essential as a beginning; that community financial aid is equally essential, either through a modification of present methods of taxation, so as to encourage building, or through direct loans at low interest, or both. In the end, probably much must be done directly by cities themselves, both in building and in controlling rents. As long as individual profit is the main reliance in getting buildings constructed, the evils of housing and resulting degenerating reaction upon social life will continue. The health of the people is of more consequence than individual profit. The death rate varies inversely with the size of living-apartments; it was found in Glasgow to be more than twice as high for families living in one room as for those living in four rooms or more. It has been found that children from one-room homes are inferior in both height and weight to children from two-, three-, and four-room homes. Dr. Carol Aronovici [1] quotes from a Scotch investigation as follows:

> It cannot be an accident that boys in one-room houses should be 11.7 pounds lighter on an average than boys from four-room houses and 4.7 inches smaller . . . and girls, 14 pounds lighter, and 5.3 inches shorter.

Miss Mildred Chadsey, Sanitary Inspector of the Health Department of Cleveland, states:

> Our city has prepared a set of pin maps that show where the cases of tuberculosis, contagious diseases, of gastro-intestinal diseases, of infants' deaths, and all deaths which have occurred during the year, are marked. It has prepared another set of pin maps showing where the foul plumbing, and filthy yard closets, the dark rooms, the overcrowded lots, are; and in every map the pins have gone in about the same place.

City health and the social cost of sickness. Closely related to the problem of city housing is that of the health of the city. Health

[1] *Housing and the Housing Problem*, p. 12.

is, of course, not only a city problem. It is a more general problem of population vitality, regardless of the type of community. Nevertheless, both causes and remedies are so clearly seen in the life of the modern city that it is wise to describe the health problem and its social character in connection with the discussion of city organization.

Recent statistics indicate that the length of man's life is increasing. "The past decade there has been an increase of two and three fourths years in the average duration of life. The average age of man in this country, according to the most recent figures, is 54.3 years, as compared with 51.5 in 1910 and 49.2 in 1901." [1] For ages it has been a common belief that sickness and health are matters beyond human control. If sickness came to one there was nothing to do but endure it, nor was it possible to prevent its coming. And unfortunately, there are many to-day who still think of sickness in this way; and they demand also the right as individuals to do as they please in regard to their own sickness, refusing to see that it reaches beyond themselves and is thoroughly a social problem both in cause and in effect. The vital energy of a people conditions its productive power and affects its happiness; other things being equal, the people of greatest vigor of body and mind is most successful and most influential in the world's life. The state of the health of a people is therefore one of the aspects of its life which ought to interest it most profoundly. It is measured by the average length of life and also by the number of working days which are lost because of sickness; and, secondarily, it is shown by the extent of degenerating social habits, such as drinking, gambling, vice, and the use of drugs, which speedily pass into disease conditions of body or mind. Sick life is weak life.

The prevalence of sickness is variable and depends upon social knowledge, social conditions in the life about us, and social habits and standards. The spread of the outdoor life ideals of recent years has led to improvement of health for many, just as has the reduction in the use of alcohol at one end of the scale and the establishment of health clinics at the other. The individual may count for much, and every effort to persuade individuals to use intelli-

[1] Bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

gence and will-power in keeping the body in health is of great importance, but ignorance of what to do can be remedied only by a concerted educational activity of the community. Social conditions, such as crowded city-tenement housing, poorly lighted and unventilated factories, unprotected food supplies, impure water or milk, suggest the helplessness of the individual. To better the health status of a people, social action by communities and often by the entire Nation becomes essential.

Money cost of sickness. Thinking only of the monetary aspect, sickness represents the using-up of wealth and the failure to produce it. Man is labor-power, and we may think, therefore, of sickness and death as a reduction of productive activity. To this may be added the cost of institutions for the care of the sick and the cost to individuals for medical service and care. And then there is the equally certain though less calculable cost involved in the resulting poverty and the consequent support by society of families dependent upon a wage-earner whom sickness or death has visited. Sickness is evidently a using of social capital and may be stated, though inadequately, in terms of money. To the extent that it is avoidable, it is a sheer waste of such capital. Precisely as the wholesale destruction of life upon the battle-field is a cruel and savage waste of the world's resources, so the shortening of the physical life and the working life by conditions of disease which ought to be prevented is nothing but a blind waste of those human resources of power and vigor which constitute society's greatest physical treasure. As the pamphlet distributed among tenement-dwellers by the New York Health Department says, in striking phrase, "It is hard to get money. It is harder to spend it right. Health is wealth." And this statement begins to take form when we learn that it is estimated that the wage-earners of the United States lose every year through sickness alone about 775 millions of dollars.[1] Reckoning that this country has a million and a half deaths annually, and that three million of our people are sick continuously each year, the cost to the Nation which might be saved by using known means of prevention is now estimated as something like two billion dollars.

[1] The recent thorough study on *Waste in Industry*, by the Federated American Engineers, estimates the economic loss from preventable sickness and death of workers as $1,800,000,000.

Of this huge amount one billion is the social cost of the six or seven hundred thousand deaths which might have been prevented each year, and the remainder is the waste from sickness, assuming that from forty to fifty per cent of present sickness could be avoided.

The most important destructive elements in making this total are tuberculosis and infant mortality. Tuberculosis alone Irving Fisher calculates as costing the Nation one billion dollars annually. And yet it is to be remembered that the death-rate from tuberculosis has been reduced by one half in forty years. This was accomplished through such measures as "the reporting of cases by physicians, the establishment of dispensaries, the visitation of patients by trained nurses, and the provision of hospitals." [1] A baby has been estimated by Fisher and others as having (before the War) the monetary value of ninety dollars; at the same date in the United States two hundred thousand babies died every year from preventable diseases. This cost might be saved through such measures as pure air and pure milk, the encouragement of mother-feeding, instruction of mothers, proper attendance at childbirth, and medical supervision.

Industrial accidents alone result in the death of from twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand workers each year in the United States.[2] In the United States one million of the population has tuberculosis, over two thirds of them being in the 'work-age' period of life — that is, between fifteen and forty-five years of age; two thirds of the 130,000 annual deaths from tuberculosis occur among wage-earners. The general gain in control of tuberculosis has been of but little value to the laboring classes. About ten per cent of wage-earners work under conditions directly conducive to tuberculosis and other respiratory diseases. "Poor houses, inadequate nourishment, and insufficient clothing, with long hours and unsanitary conditions of labor," writes Streightoff, "combine to undermine the health of industrial people. . . . Accidents throw into distress or actual pauperism many families. Disease, too, is at work, especially among a tenement-house population and the over-

[1] Special Public Health Commission, New York, *Report*, p. 22.

[2] Twenty-five thousand was Hoffman's estimate for 1913. The Federated American Engineers (*Waste in Industry*, p. 331) report twenty-three thousand in 1919. C. H. Verrill estimated (in 1921) the deaths from industrial accidents at twenty thousand per year. (*American Economic Review Supplement*, Michigan, 1922.)

worked factory people, causing physical and economic suffering." [1] The New York City Department of Health, in an examination of 484 factories in which were employed almost 75,000 workers, found the following conditions leading to ill-health: Harmful dusts in 173 plants, dangerous fumes and gases in 84, excessive humidity in 29, unguarded machinery in 64, defective lighting in 117, poor ventilation in 89, dirty workrooms in 171, common drinking-cups in 121, common towels in 104, defective plumbing in 60, inadequate or unsanitary washing facilities in 77, inadequate or unsanitary toilets in 165, lack of lockers in 66, lack of first-aid equipment in 29, improper or inadequate seats in 188.[2] As Watkins well says, "Protection of the nation's workers is the foundation of economic efficiency. There is no more serious phase of the labor problem than the wastes of human health and life incident to the production of wealth." [3] It is well to remember in these days of international struggle that the development and increase of vigor and strength among our people may prove the most valuable asset in our national economy.

Relation of sickness to poverty. The cost of sickness is not alone to be found expressed in the direct money waste involved in disease and death. Indirectly, but no less certainly, a large part of the social cost of poverty, of crime and of vice is found in sickness. Poverty and sickness are phases of a common problem and the same may be said of the relationships of sickness and crime. The pin maps of city health departments tell to the observer whose eyes are open a powerful story of social waste: for the pins which indicate death or sickness are massed where the housing is worst, the streets and tenements most congested, the wages lowest, the standard of living poorest. And if this congestion of the sickness pin map is compared with the map recording juvenile delinquency or adult crime, once more one is startled by the absolute overlapping and the conclusive evidence presented that he is facing common problems. Where sickness abounds, there poverty is found; there, too, more children go wrong in the struggle to find life and joy; and

[1] Streightoff: *The Standard of Living*, p. 134.
[2] Quoted in Watkins: *Introduction to the Study of Labor Problems*, p. 200.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 190.

there men and women grow hopeless of the battle, not only for higher material standards, but hopeless, perhaps cynical, in regard to morality itself. Certainly to-day we are justified in the judgment that much of immorality and crime is but the expression of a sick body or mind.

Says A. G. Warner,[1] "Personal acquaintance with the destitute classes has deepened the conviction that most of the causes of poverty result from or result in weakened physical or mental constitutions often merging into actual disease." And E. T. Devine tells us,[2] out of his experience with poverty in New York, "Poor health is more common than poor character." He reports that three quarters of the families helped by the Charity Organization Society showed sickness to be a serious condition; while one fourth of five thousand cases needing help were widows, half of them with dependent children to be cared for. To this we may add the estimate of the United States Public Health Service that "three fifths of the workers of the country must ask for public or private charity when disabled by disease or weakness." Consider, too, this comparison made by the Health Department of the city of Birmingham, England, of the sickness in working-men's families:[3] "In the group of families where the income of the father was less than one pound per week, the infant death rate was 204; while in the families where the income ran from one pound upward, the rate was but 137." Or take this from the Johnstown Survey made by the Children's Bureau: "Where the father's income was under $521, the infant death rate was 255.7; while for incomes ranging from $521 to $624, the rate was 157.6; and for incomes of $1200 or more, the rate was 83.3." Or, the infant death rate in the lowest income group is twice that of the next group and three times that of the upper income group. Is not the intermingling of sickness and poverty thoroughly evident? If we were seeking to determine which is cause and which is effect, we might more frequently be forced to the recognition that poverty creates sickness, as these figures show. But every social worker or student of social economy recognizes the interdependence of these two conditions, and real-

[1] *American Charities*, pp. 52–54. Thomas Y. Crowell Co.
[2] *Misery and its Causes*, ch. II.
[3] *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, March, 1916.

izes that any attempt to abolish or lessen one of them is, in so far, an attack upon the other. "Disease is at work," says Streightoff,[1] "especially in a tenement-house population and the overworked factory people, causing physical and economic suffering." And "the burden of sickness now borne entirely by the workman is responsible for fully one third of the poverty of this country," says another careful student.[2] But, reversing the statement, Streightoff declares, "Poor houses, inadequate nourishment, and insufficient clothing, combined with long hours and unsanitary conditions of labor, unite to undermine the health of industrial people." Tuberculosis is, as every social worker knows, primarily a "disease of under-vitalization due to under-feeding, overwork, congestion, and bad sanitary conditions." And similarly, as has been shown in a careful investigation in Massachusetts, "the fundamental cause of infant mortality is poverty; the fundamental fact is low wages."

Sickness and human suffering. But the cost of sickness, ultimately, is found not only in money wasted, nor in the increase of poverty and crime. It is a problem of human happiness. Sickness mars the joy of living, and its greatest cost is in this fact. And not only is the happiness of the individual directly concerned at issue; but much of the happiness of family and friends rests on the radiation of cheer and the helpful vital spirits of good health, as contrasted with the depression of complaining, melancholic or irritable moods associated so naturally and so commonly with sickness. And it needs not a physician to tell us that abounding health is a great aid in the building of individual moral habits and activities, and that weary days and jangled nerves are constant conditions of degenerate life, forming serious stumbling-blocks in the struggle for finer and better character.

Society cannot escape the consequences of these facts. They are social facts, the outcome of conditions of social life, and their burden inevitably passes over to society itself. The miseries of crime and poverty may seem to be borne by the individual, but eventually they tap the social treasure-house and deplete our monetary social capital, our stores of vital energy, our reservoirs of strong

[1] *Standard of Living*, p. 134.
[2] H. H. Hibbs, in *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November, 1915.

and hopeful coöperative effort for the better social order. Society must face the question whether it is willing to meet this problem in an unorganized way, with its resulting weakness and evil, or meet it by social organization and constructively through prevention and insurance, producing thereby a more vigorous and virile people. In one of these ways society must meet it; the cost comes back to society with absolute certainty; there is no other alternative.

We thus may summarize the situation as follows: sickness limits economic production and general social efficiency; it leads to abnormal life with craving for the artificial stimulation of drugs, alcohol, gambling, and vice; it thus becomes a dominant cause of crime, of pauperism, and of other forms of social degeneracy.

Remedies. The brief sketch of conditions suggests that the prime social causes of preventable sickness are poverty, ignorance (usually resulting from poverty), and fatigue resulting from conditions of labor. To meet the situation probably no measure of a direct medical sort is so important as the economic attack upon poverty. Every physician who works with the poor — and few do not — realizes the overwhelming obstacle which poverty raises to the cure or prevention of sickness. The growing enlistment of medical men in the determination to get rid of poverty is therefore a movement of great hopefulness. As a part of the effort to abolish poverty must inevitably be included social insurance against sickness, by which the costs of illness and the loss of wages among wage-earning families may be met. Better control of industrial conditions in regard to health, through a reduction of the hours of work and the lessening of fatigue, are also a necessary part of the social policy against both sickness and poverty. Direct health education, particularly of mothers in regard to the care of children, is of fundamental importance. The establishment of health centers both in cities and in rural regions, combining health education, hospital facilities, trained nursing for homes as well as hospitals, and medical advice, is perhaps the most promising development in the general field of preventive medicine; it expresses the growing recognition of public-health problems — the fact that health is a public concern and must be fostered by public measures.

Thus, inevitably, health, recreation, housing, together with the

underlying conditions of poverty, are aspects of one problem. They are aspects of the life of the people which the economic order exists to build; and they call for the most intelligent direction of community effort. The healthy life is the efficient life.

City recreation. Recreation means, broadly, "the way in which time is spent by men and women away from their regular work."

The massing of great city populations has brought into prominence the serious problem of city recreation. In comparatively recent years there has been a growing recognition of the social value and need of recreation. The growth of character is considerably determined by the recreation associations which one shares. Under the spell of recreation the mind is open and spontaneous; inborn impulses are more free to express themselves. It is probably because of its spontaneous quality that recreation refreshes one and so renews and invigorates him.

Recreation is social. But recreation is not isolated; it is found in association. What its real value may be is therefore dependent upon the type of associations and upon the opportunities which are made possible for wholesome expression of the recreational life. In simple rural life the background of wild nature is itself an imagination-stirring source and stimulator of adventure and of friendly but vigorous play effort. The recreational lack of the rural world is companionship which furnishes the competitive stimulus in sport. But the difficulties in the way of city recreation are of another sort. Congestion of living-conditions brings it to pass that there is no place to play. The family ought to be the center of much of the simpler recreational life. But the crowded, dark, unfurnished tenement apartments not only weaken family life in general, but drive both children and adults into the streets and alleys for their recreation. It is safe to say that the most usual playground of the city child is the city street, made for industry and not for play, and upon which usually many forms of play are forbidden.

Moreover, it is to be expected that "the neighborhood should also provide opportunities for its own recreation." But cities destroy neighborhood life, so that the organization of play by neighborhoods at least is difficult, unless aided and encouraged by the city as a whole.

Commercialized recreation. Unfortunately, the need for and delight in recreation and in recreational companionship, is taken advantage of by commercial enterprise long before it is seen to have an important place in social life and to deserve careful community organization for the sake of its reaction upon social welfare. Recreation organized for profit is not directed to social welfare, but to the amount of profit. The tendency toward recreation is, also, usually not an educated one nor upon a high level, but is impulsive, without standards, and therefore easily led by crowd suggestion. It is this fact which suggests the social need of education in and for recreation, and which has driven cities to realize the sordid danger to social welfare of the complete subordination of recreation to commercial motives and organization.

Until its abolition by the Eighteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, the saloon was probably the most important and prevalent form of commercialized recreation. It is probable that more people made use of it than of all other purchasable recreational possibilities. The basis of hostility to the saloon, expressed in varied proposals of limitation and ending in its definite elimination, was the fact that the motive of profit upon which it rested prevented recreation and companionship from being wholesome and constructive. The saloon as a means of recreation ends in being destructive instead of re-creative. But the saloon afforded a place and opportunity for association, which is the simplest and most usable means of recreation; and since abolishing the saloon, because of its debasing influence, cities have made little effort to meet the need for places of pleasant and agreeable association for the laborer. Society has been more interested in destroying a recognized evil than in meeting an evident human need.

Other forms of commercial recreation are the dance-hall, the moving-picture show, vaudeville shows, the theater, the ball park. Evidently these are not to be considered as all of the same kind, nor to be judged alike. The unregulated commercial dance-hall is menacing to social welfare because of the sex motive and the unguarded character of the associations. City life lures youth from country towns and villages. Its living quarters make family recreation, such as dancing, impossible for its crowded tenement

residents. The "starved longing for joy and companionship" (described by Jane Addams in her *Spirit of Youth and the City Street*) leads these young people to the dance-hall as the only or most available meeting-place for recreation. Under such circumstances, if evil follows, it but indicates the overwhelming need that the city community should control and regulate or undertake the direct provision of suitable opportunities for such social meeting and recreation. Investigations indicate that in large cities a very high per cent of adolescent school children (under sixteen years of age) learn to dance in public dancing academies and dance more or less regularly in public dance-halls. While conditions vary, the supervision is rarely adequate, and suggestions and opportunities for evil abound. Recreation investigations — such as the California Recreation Report — point to the unsupervised public dance-hall as one of the dangerously immoral agencies in city life.

The problem of the moving-picture show is a serious one primarily because of the youthful age of so large a per cent of the usual audience. The wonderful attractiveness, the marvel of the pictures as such, cheapness, the lack of need to think, all contribute to the recognized fact that moving pictures are probably far the most popular amusement to-day. Very many children go regularly every night, and many adults adopt a similar plan. Whether the pictures are a benefit or a harm to their audiences depends upon many factors, but particularly upon the quality of suggestion which the films arouse. The stirring of passion and the appeal to emotions at a low level is the most serious of evils. Very many films depict scenes of brutality, of crime, or of sex passion; these are bound to have evil consequences in their impression upon young or adolescent minds. For this reason some form of social control or direction is much needed, either through a municipal censorship or perhaps through a national board, and ultimately through educated public opinion.

Relation of the level of recreation to industrial conditions. It is to be remembered, however, both in regard to moving pictures and other commercial amusements of the modern city, that there is a close relation between work and play, and that this inevitably has much to do with the type of recreation which appeals. Machine

industry as found in city life is both monotonous and exhausting; consequently the recreation demanded cannot be, as a rule, upon a high level of education; and for many it must be passive rather than active, affording amusement only. It has been well said that "the hotter the pace at which work is set, the more recreation will sink to the sensual and the exciting.... The longer and the intenser the hours of labor, the more debasing the forms of recreation become." [1] At the very best it must be said that a nervous, tired public, reacting from the strain and monotony of exhausting work and bad conditions of living, "refuses anything that demands sustained attention."

Educational reformers are apt to try to turn every form of recreation to educational uses, and to assume that a somewhat high intellectual level must be maintained. But the demand for relaxation for tired lives is very great. To meet this demand by the stimulation of alcoholic intoxication has been a great social evil. But with the abolition of the saloon there appears the greater need for the type of amusement which the moving picture can give. For this reason it is highly important that the community itself should not only take great interest in the type of films shown, guarding, primarily, against those which appeal to sensual and brutal impulses, but should also keep the cost low and in other ways enlarge the possibilities of these 'theaters of the common people.' It is, at least under present working conditions, primarily important that the films be kept decent rather than that they be highly instructive.

Social provision for city recreation. In recent years there has grown an interest in recreation and with it a demand that cities should provide and organize directly the recreational life of their people. The reaction from Puritan hostility to play, a growing delight in the outdoor life, reduction of the hours of labor, closer association of numbers in city life which makes it easy to gather playgroups together, all have had to do with this growing interest. With it, too, is a recognition that lack of suitable recreational opportunity is a prolific source of delinquency; where play can be readily and freely organized, under efficient leadership, beneficial

[1] Simkhovitch: *The City Worker's World in America*, p. 109.

association follows and behavior is normal. But if play is forbidden or made difficult, idle associations lead to evil, crime itself becomes a game, and into the 'acquired nature' is built habits of evil.

It is becoming apparent that the leisure life of the city holds the key to the progress of modern society. If, as seems probable, the reduction of city work-hours shall continue, both the possibilities and dangers will be increasingly apparent. Through the wise organization of its leisure, cities may make recreation mean health and happiness; they may upbuild the levels of taste for both enjoyment and beauty; they may substitute wholesome suggestion and interests for delinquency and vice. Beginnings only in this field of social effort have been made. Among them the most interesting is the city-playground movement, which began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and which has since found a place in the life of more than six hundred cities in the United States. Large city parks as show places are giving way to smaller and more numerous neighborhood play spaces. Play directors organize and supervise games; and to some degree play-houses for use in bad weather and for other kinds of activities than the open field sports are hastening the development of neighborhood centers for acquaintance, coöperation, and mutual entertainment. Other community-recreation movements, such as the acquisition of water-fronts for swimming and boating, point in the same direction. Unfortunately, the rapid growth of cities makes the acquisition of space more and more costly.

Not only should communities provide the opportunities, the organizing direction, and the direct negative limitation to be placed upon amusements and forms of recreation; public standards also must be set through the self-education of the community life. The level of pleasures tends to be low, partly because their control has too often been in the hands of men of evil mind; but partly also because pleasures often appeal to selfishness, to sense satisfaction, and to animal impulse. It is because of this fact that it is a part of the work of the community to create opportunities for its recreation and also to educate its members to high levels of recreational enjoyment. The fact that recreation is so often sensual and low has led to the policy of repression or prohibition. As an isolated policy

it has always failed; the inborn nature demands recreation and will find it in low ways if finer are not possible. The wise policy is rather that of substitution; if low or even criminal association affords the only chance for play and adventure, a public playground with ball-park and swimming-pool will quickly change the direction of interest and attention. Street-corner idle groups need direction and organizing out of passive amusement into games, camp-life, or other wholesome play.

It seems reasonable that a definite municipal recreation policy should, therefore, be embodied in the life of every city. Commercial control must give way to social organization for social welfare. In order that recreation shall be wholesome, both frequent places and suitable conditions of associations must be undertaken as an important and even central aspect of city planning. Reading-rooms and libraries, music-halls, neighborhood supervised playgrounds, with their buildings for clubs, dances, and dramatic entertainments: these suggest the lines of interest which all cities will probably in time assume as public activities, with the same regularity that they now build and organize their public schools.

Concluding summary. Just as the housing and health of the city and its recreation cannot be left to be provided by the individual or the family, because the crowded masses of people and the complex conditions of their existence render families and individuals helpless for such purposes, so many of the strictly economic activities call in like manner for community regulation or organization. Water, sewerage, light, and other so-called public utilities have come to be recognized as community problems, impossible of solution by unregulated individual competition. Either through careful regulating control or probably, in the end, by direct municipal administration, the community must provide for its own welfare in these vital social matters.

We have been considering the transformation of society which has followed the industrial revolution. With the new organization of the methods of production populations have been swept into new relations and arrangements. Agriculture has gone down, relatively, in the scale, and the city has arisen as the center of industry and commerce. The city is a new type of community life; the forms and

customs by which a rural society was organized are not suited to the compact mass life of the city. Individual action and private ownership must be limited in new ways in the interest of a wholesome social life. To find these new principles of coöperation is the key to the development of city life.

READING REFERENCES

Carver, T. N.: *Rural Economics.*
Gillette, J. M.: *Rural Sociology.*
Hart, J. K.: *Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities,* chs. x to xiv.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology,* chs. v, vi, vii.
Phelan, J.: *Readings in Rural Sociology.*
Vogt, P. L.: *Rural Sociology,* chs. vii, viii, ix, xi, xv, xvi, xviii.
Wilson, W. H.: *Evolution of the Country Community.*
Groves, E. R.: *The Rural Mind and Social Welfare.*
Howe, F. C.: *The Modern City,* ch. xxi.
Zueblin, C.: *American Municipal Progress,* chs. v, vi, vii.
Byington, M. F.: *Homestead: The Households of a Mill Town.*
Bacon, A. F.: *Beauty for Ashes.*
Aronovici, C.: *Housing and the Housing Problem.*
King, C.: *Lower Living Costs in Cities,* ch. xvi.
Wood, Edith: *Housing of the Unskilled Worker.*
Abbott, Edith: *Women in Industry.*
Commons, J. R.: *Industrial Goodwill.*
Davis, M. M.: *The Exploitation of Pleasure.*
Rainwater, C. E.: *The Play Movement in the United States.*
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology,* ch. xliii.
Simkhovitch, M.: *The City Worker's World,* ch. vi.
Henderson, C. H.: *Citizens in Industry,* ch. ii.
Devine, E. T.: *Misery and its Causes,* ch. ii.
Fisher, I.: *Report on National Vitality.*
Godfrey, H.: *The Health of the City.*
Hill, H. W.: *The New Public Health.*
Fisk, E. L.: *Health Building and Life Extension.*
Report, Association of Federated Engineers: *Waste in Industry.*
Cannon, Ida: *Social Work in Hospitals.*
Moore, H. H.: *Public Health in the United States.*

QUESTIONS

1. Which is the more powerful current, 'back to the land,' or cityward?
2. What are the effects upon rural society of newer means of communication?
3. Are rural social institutions adapted to present rural needs? What are these institutions? Which of them seems most vigorous?
4. Along what lines has rural coöperation been attempted and why? Study

the rural coöperative movement in Ireland or Denmark. Is it possible to develop social, as well as economic, life around the idea of coöperation?

5. What are the social advantages of city life? Are there compensating advantages found in rural life?
6. What is the relation of bad housing to the home? to sickness? to recreation?
7. As possible municipal policies in regard to housing, which of the following plans has most promise: (a) Leave the question to be solved by each family for itself on a commercial basis. (b) Let the city pass a building ordinance defining the kind of building which may be constructed. (c) Let the city encourage building either by developing areas on which it builds houses and rents them at low rates; or by remitting taxes for a period of years to owners who build their own homes.
8. Have rents tended to demand an increasing or decreasing proportion of family income since the War? Find facts in your own community.
9. What are the three "vitality classes" described by Giddings? (In *Principles of Sociology*, p. 124.)
10. Why have cities done more than rural regions to protect health? What are the comparative positions in regard to health of city and rural populations?
11. Explain the statement, "Health is purchasable."
12. What has been the trend of the death rate in the Western world in recent times, and what has caused it?
13. Why is it not possible to leave the problem of recreation in the city to be solved by each individual or family?
14. Sketch the development or growth of the playground movement in the United States.
15. What is the relation between the need for wholesome recreation and the development of mechanical methods of manufacture?

CHAPTER XXV

THE FUNCTION OF THE ECONOMIC ORDER

THUS far, in description of the economic order, we have been surveying succeeding stages of economic production with the idea of observing the close relation of successive advances in technical knowledge and control of nature to the industrial grouping of men. We have tried to see how changes in economic grouping influence other than economic relationships, and end even in making new types of communities and new social problems, as well as suggesting new principles of social organization. It has been inevitable in making this survey that some description should have been given of the present economic life and its organization. In passing to the discussion of the function of the economic order, it will be necessary to restate briefly some characteristics of the present economic system. And it will also be well to recall that institutions and social organizations have definite social functions. What an institution does in and for society constitutes its social function; in so far as this is a worth-while or essential activity and is well done, the institution is justified and may claim a right to continued existence; but where functions cease to be performed or are poorly executed, society becomes critical of the institution and may ultimately abolish it. Much of history is a record of the failure of institutions or social arrangements to perform worth-while functions efficiently, and the consequent rebellion of society against those who claim the privileges of these institutions without giving to society anything of value.

I. MACHINERY AND LABOR

> For all men are in their own spontaneous way artists and creators, and the curse of the machine is that it standardizes thought and kills it, standardizes emotion and destroys it, standardizes the artistic sense and annihilates it.[1]

Economic institutions and the economic order have as their function, as has been said earlier, the organization of the means of

[1] Tannenbaum, F.: *The Labor Movement*, p. 58.

satisfaction of human wants, primarily to maintain life, but secondarily, to enable society to live well — that is, to enrich life. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution in the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in knowledge and control of nature and in the application of knowledge to economic production, has enormously enriched the world's life. Two ways of describing the present methods of production may be suggested: Our age is called 'the age of machinery and machine power,' these terms calling attention to the fact that nature has been made the servant of man; our economic age is also called 'the age of industrial capitalism,' by which attention is drawn to the way in which this new mastery of nature is humanly organized, directed, and owned. These two characterizations of present methods of production suggest fundamental problems of uncertainty and conflict in the economic order: problems of mechanization of man as a worker, and problems of capital consolidation and control of production processes and goods. In addition to these aspects the economic order, looked at from the view of financial or monetary organization, may be described as a pecuniary relationship of the units of production based on the motive of profit. To-day men work, primarily, not to produce goods, but to make a profit.

Work and the mind of the worker. Goods to satisfy human wants are the joint product of land and its natural resources, of labor, and of other goods either partly completed or in the form of machines; all are brought together by some one who undertakes their organization. In this organization machines have come to have a greater and greater importance. Specialization of machines has advanced rapidly, until many workers have become machine-tenders instead of skilled specialists. The highly skilled specialist in any occupation tends to develop creative power; his inventiveness is appealed to; and work is a field of interest and the basis of growth in mind and character. But the evil of the specialization of machinery is that the reaction upon the worker is not mental stimulation but the wearying, even deadening result of monotony: the worker becomes as unthinking as the machine. Larger and larger grows the percentage of labor which has no interest in productive work, and whose only motive for working is the wages with which

it is bought. There could be no more seriously evil reaction upon men as members of society than this mechanizing of labor. Work ought to be not only the production of goods, but a basis of discipline and of creative imagination of the workers. There are still kinds of work which build creative interest, but they grow constantly fewer in number as machines are specialized and need only the care of the machine-tender. Herein lies one of the most insidious conditions of modern industry. Undoubtedly the prime purpose of work is to produce goods, but goods themselves should contribute to the life of man, not only of those who buy them but also of those who make them. Society has often found it wise to forbid certain dangerous kinds or conditions of manufacturing in the interest of the workers, such for example as the making of phosphorus matches; but in the long run the decay of the workers' interest which results from the over-specializing of machinery is more deadly to labor and a more serious social evil than the hazards of bodily disease or danger. This is the problem of the effect of machinery upon labor.

II. Concentration of Ownership

The second aspect of modern production to be understood is the fact that the instruments used in production are owned, not by those who handle them, but by others. In the days of hand work the worker owned his tools; commonly, also, he owned or controlled the place in which he worked and the materials with which he worked. The modern worker no longer owns any of these things; he sells his labor — skilled or unskilled — to the man or group of men who own or control the machinery, the place of work, and the materials. Work, thus, is organized by one group — the capitalist — which employs or buys labor. It is quite conceivable that a different arrangement might have come into existence following the great mechanical inventions which characterize the industrial revolution; the workers might have come to own the new machines, just as formerly they owned their tools; and they might have themselves organized the new methods of production. But while this is conceivable, nothing of this kind was really possible. The new machinery massed in the factory involves a cost far beyond the

resources of working-men, and it also calls for organizing ability which only an occasional man possesses. Thus, therefore, modern capitalism stands for the private ownership by one or more individuals of instruments of production, these individuals bargaining with labor for its services. And, therefore, the great increase in productiveness which results from the use of machinery and steam power has come to belong to those who own the machines rather than to those — the great body of workers — who sell their labor. The enormous growth in wealth which resulted from machine production became massed in the hands of a small class, and our own day has, therefore, seen two outstanding related economic facts: the creation of far greater wealth than the world has hitherto dreamed of, but also the concentration of this wealth as private property in comparatively few hands.

As capital has grown in relative importance in the production of wealth, and as large amounts of capital have become essential for many undertakings, the device of the corporation has been developed as a legal instrument for gathering and organizing capital. The corporation permits capital to be gathered from many sources, with limited liability for losses to individual shareholders. By means of this economic instrument the capital necessary for large-scale production is put in the hands of industrial managers who organize the industries, the shareholders being interested primarily in the receipt of dividends upon their stock in the corporation and having little or nothing to do with the industrial problems involved.

III. Conflict between Capital and Labor

The increasing importance and dominant position of capital (that is to say, machinery and products used in making goods), together with the separation of labor from the ownership of the tools or machines used, has resulted in the growth of conflict between capital and labor. The worker does not organize industry; it 'takes capital' to start a business, as the saying is. Thus the opportunity to obtain the means of livelihood for the mass of mankind rests with those who control capital by which industry is organized. Labor must, therefore, look to organized capital for the chance to work, and thus the worker becomes a seller of his labor. He is,

however, not a good seller, both because of the plentifulness of his fellow laborers who compete with him for the chance to work, and because of the fact that his labor is not something separate from his life, but is a part of himself, so that in order to live he must sell without much delay. Thus, the terms of the bargain for his labor have tended to be set by the capital organizer. As compared with the days of slavery, the laborer is legally free to bargain and to contract his services as he will. This freedom of contract has meant much to him legally and politically; it marks a distinct stage of progress for him. But economically he is still weak because his bargaining power is poor.

To change this fact, labor has tried to bargain collectively instead of individually. In order to strengthen their position workers have realized that by uniting in solid groups they may eliminate competition with each other. Thus has grown the organization of labor. Labor as represented in these organizations has felt that the main share of the increased wealth due to machine methods goes to capital. It believes such a division to be unfair and hopes through collective bargaining to improve wages. It also attempts to change the conditions governing industry, including such things as the hours of work, working arrangements in the way of sanitation and conveniences, and personal relations between employer and employee.

Effect of the industrial revolution upon the position of labor. The position which labor has occupied since the industrial revolution is distinctly different from what it was in preceding periods. Professor Hoxie,[1] in discussing the industrial revolution, describes the consequences to labor somewhat as follows. The new machinery was too expensive for the small, independent worker; he therefore lost the ownership of his tools. The new machinery was too heavy to place in the house of the workman, and steam could not economically be applied to isolated machines. Therefore, the merchant gathered workers and machines into mills of his own. The worker in this way lost control of the workshop. Thus he became a wage-worker. The new machinery split production into many small processes, involving little skill or training and led to no know-

[1] Hoxie: *Trade Unionism*, p. 241.

ledge of the trade as a whole. Therefore, the worker lost his control of the trade and trade conditions, and his trade education. Power and machinery must work regularly; therefore, the worker must go to the factory at a fixed time and work while the power was applied. Hence he lost control of the hours of labor. Power concentrates production; hence the great manufacturing city; the worker lost control of his home and became the tenant of the landlord. The specializing of processes made possible the employment of unskilled workers — even women and children. Hence the lowering of wages through competition with low-grade workers; and hence followed the congestion of population in manufacturing centers, with unsanitary conditions, bad housing, lowering of morality, poverty, and drunkenness.

IV. Poverty of the Masses

The test of institutions is the fulfillment of function. So the entire economic life with its interrelated institutions must face this test. Private property, free contract, the corporation, machine industry, represent fundamental institutions and aspects of the modern economic order. The function of the economic life is to provide the means of life to man. On the side of production of goods there can be no doubt of the large degree of success which has been attained. Mankind now has sufficiently mastered the secrets of nature to be able to feed and clothe and house its members and keep them in health and efficiency. Nevertheless, in spite of the growing power of production and the rapid increase in the world's wealth, poverty is widespread and severe. The failure of our society is not in its productiveness, but in the distribution of its wealth. The poverty of the masses of mankind is the standing challenge to the economic order. Face to face with the abundance of wealth is the abject suffering, through poverty, of great numbers of the population. If the economic order were fulfilling its function well, this would not be the case, and undoubtedly, therefore, the critical central and unsolved problem in economic life is that of the distribution of wealth — the fact of poverty in the face of abundance. As Alfred Marshall has said, "The study of the causes of poverty is the study of a large part of the degradation of mankind."[1]

[1] *Principles of Economics*, p. 3. The Macmillan Co.

The nature of poverty. The reaction of poverty upon social life in all its aspects makes it the most fundamental of social problems. It is properly studied in connection with the economic order, since it is primarily an aspect of the economic life. Poverty is economic failure, or, as it is described by Dr. Hollander, it is "economic insufficiency." It varies in its spread with different conditions and systems of industry; its intensity does not vary so much with the amount of wealth held by society in general as with the ideas of society in regard to the ownership of wealth.

Because material wealth is so important as a basis for the many non-material values in life, it is easy to confuse poverty, or the lack of wealth, with the lack of these other values. Thus poverty is often considered as meaning a poor life, as though one were describing the quality of the individual. This is only to confuse ideas. The economic world is not the end of life, but a means; but it is a necessary basis upon which life builds, and so in describing poverty we are not describing kinds or types of people, but conditions and characteristics of society, in which people live and by which their characters are formed.

Extent of poverty. Strictly speaking, it is impossible to measure the extent of poverty, since poverty is a relative term. How much is necessary as a basis for normal growth? What is economic sufficiency? No single answer is possible; the standard of living of one people or one age differs from that of another; and the personal element enters to make the problem more uncertain, since "to know how to use wisely what one has is to double its value." Yet, beginning with the physical necessities — food, clothing, and housing — one is blind if he does not see that there are many whose incomes will not, no matter how wisely expended, supply those primary wants in such a way as to maintain physical efficiency. And it is equally impossible to fail to recognize that recreation, education, travel, stimulating companionship, and other aspects of life which enlarge and enrich it, are almost if not altogether unshared by very many even of those whose bodies do not actually suffer. *The real test of the evil of poverty is found at the point where the lack of income begins to narrow or degrade the mental and moral life.* The length of life of those whose incomes are in the lowest grades is

probably not over half that of those in comfortable circumstances, while ignorance and often apathy or waywardness are bound to characterize their lives.[1] The efforts, therefore, to describe the amount of existing poverty, though varying somewhat with the standards of the investigator, nevertheless throw much light upon the problem.

Among investigations of poverty in England the most famous is the long and careful work undertaken by Charles Booth. This is a study of poverty in London and was completed in 1902. It showed that 30.7 per cent of the population of what was then the richest city of the world were in actual want. Rowntree, in studying the population of the manufacturing city of York, concluded that 43.4 per cent of the wage-earning class were living in poverty, or 27.84 per cent of the entire population.

Bowley estimates for Great Britain as a whole that "we shall find somewhat over thirteen per cent of the industrial working-class population" below the minimum standard of living. More recently, Money, in 1914, concludes, after a careful study of the English situation, that "the great mass of the people of the United Kingdom" are in poverty.[2]

Studies of the situation in America show a similar serious and widespread poverty. Hunter, in 1904, concluded that at least four million people in the United States were living in the extremest poverty, while ten million were below the standard of physical efficiency. Parmelee's estimate is even higher. He calls attention to the fact that in a high proportion of cases it is only by the additional earnings of other members of the family than the father that incomes rise above the poverty line, and quotes the British Board of Trade investigation into American conditions, to the effect that "the higher incomes" (of wage-earning families) "are due . . . to the contributions of children of wage-earning age." Gillin concludes that from five to eight per cent of the American population is in pauperism; that is, is in receipt of charitable aid. Evidence of

[1] "It is, indeed, a special feature of destitution in modern urban communities that it means not merely a lack of food, clothing, and shelter, but also a condition of mental degradation." (Webb: *The Prevention of Destitution.*)

[2] In his *Poverty and Dependency*, ch. IV, Gillin summarizes both fully and carefully the results of the more important English and American investigations.

the prevalence of poverty is found in all investigations of family income and expenditure in relation to prices. Many such studies have been made both before and during the War. As a single illustration, the report of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for the District of Columbia covering the year 1916 states that in the City of Washington "38 per cent of 2110 families investigated had yearly incomes of less than $900 per year, and 61 per cent had less than $1200." The average size of the families was between four and five persons. This was a period of rapidly rising prices, and the New York municipal investigation of the cost of living at the same period (February, 1917) states that "the barest minimum of existence (covering only physical needs) for normal families is from $900 to $1000."

Parmelee, in his thorough work upon *Poverty and Social Progress*, after carefully distinguishing pauperism from poverty, and estimating that "the number of persons in this country receiving charitable aid ranges from five to ten per cent of the total population," summarizes his conclusion in regard to poverty as follows:

> Our wage statistics have shown that a large part of the wage-earning families must be in poverty and in some cases in pauperism, except when the earnings of the head of the family are supplemented by the earnings of other members of the family. We have seen that in all probability many of the working-class are in a state of poverty during certain periods of their lives. We know that at a time of industrial depression the number of the poor and of the paupers increases greatly, owing to the increase in unemployment, under-employment, and under-payment. In the last place, there is always a considerable number of those who are partly or totally unemployable on account of deficient physical or mental ability, disease, accident, or vicious characteristics, such as excessive indulgence, drunkenness, etc.[1]

Undoubtedly Rowntree's statement in regard to the five alternating periods of want and comparative plenty in wage-earning families in York is true of many laborers of other cities and countries in Europe and America. He says that the laborer will probably live in poverty during his childhood, from which he passes into the period of youth which is a period of earning and of 'comparative plenty.' After marriage and the birth of two or three children,

[1] Parmelee, M.: *Poverty and Social Progress*, p. 105. Copyright, by The Macmillan Company. Reprinted by permission.

poverty again descends on him, lasting till his children begin to earn. Then follows a period of improvement due to his children's wage, to be followed by the period of old age and poverty when his children leave home. Summarizing the situation he says:[1]

A laborer is thus in poverty and therefore underfed:
(a) In childhood — when his constitution is being built up.
(b) In early middle life — when he should be in his prime.
(c) In old age.

The appalling fact that confronts us in modern industry to-day [says Mr. Penman][2] is that millions of men with their families, and thousands of women who have been made widows by industrial accidents and the sickness due to bad and unhealthy industrial conditions, are living at the margin of subsistence. They are not earning enough to provide their families with the decencies and comforts which civilization demands. All the investigations of wages point to one result — they are insufficient for millions of people to maintain a decent livelihood.

Causes of poverty. Why is there poverty? Many answers are given to this question, and perhaps all contain some truth. But the essential fact to hold in mind is that it is by and through the economic order that life is maintained; if economic life masses wealth in the hands of some, it must give little to others. Personal factors enter the problem in so far as to help to decide that as between A and B one or the other shall be the one to receive much or little. But it is not a personal aspect which determines that there shall be some who inevitably receive but little. If an apple is divided into six pieces — one large, four medium, and one very small — and the pieces be shared among six people, one of them is going to get a small piece, no matter what his personal character.

It is, however, necessary to consider both objective and personal aspects of poverty in the effort to understand it. Pauperism stands for the fact that there are many in society who are unqualified to care for themselves; in the competitive economic struggle they are failures, largely because of bodily or mental weakness or through ignorance. These should be carefully distinguished from the mass of the poor who, in the main, show neither mental nor physical incapacity, though they are often ignorant through lack of educa-

[1] Rowntree, B. Seebohm: *Poverty, A Study of Town Life*, p. 137. Macmillan and Co.
[2] Penman, J. S.: *Poverty — The Challenge of the Church*, p. 27. The Pilgrim Press.

tion resulting from lack of economic opportunity. Probably no change in the economic order would seriously alter the existence of pauperism except in so far as ignorance and discouragement are a cause of it. Other social measures must be relied on here, principally medical, since the weakness of body and mind which induces pauperism is in reality a problem of public health.

The analysis of the causes of poverty suggests that there are a variety of conditions which accompany it. These social conditions are often called causes of poverty, and, indeed, they do become secondary causes, in that they explain why one individual rather than another is poor. Yet in reality they characterize poverty, complicating it and explaining it, rather than causing it. Such conditions are sickness, old age, the death of the family wage-earner, ignorance, child labor, bad housing. Poverty itself is called a cause of poverty, and undoubtedly this is true, to the extent that poverty leads to sickness, weakness, ignorance, and other depressing conditions which prevent men from the kind of activity which lifts them out of poverty. In so far as poverty is personal, it results either from those inborn weaknesses of body or mind which render one inefficient and unable to care for himself or others, or from ignorance and its accompaniments which react upon character and render it either unable or unwilling to struggle efficiently. Ignorance is in the main a problem of social opportunity depending upon economic opportunity. Until societies succeed in giving all their members far more of educational opportunity, not only through the schools, but also through intelligent association and training in the 'arts of life,' it will not be possible clearly to distinguish inborn incapables from those whom the inequalities of social life have made simply unfortunate.

Lescohier, in an intensely interesting article in the *Atlantic Monthly*,[1] in describing types of laborers, says:

> I am not ignorant of the fact that many personal causes contribute heavily to labor inefficiency. No man can watch the flow of migratory labor through any distributing point, like Minneapolis, without witnessing tragedies of drink, of drugs, of feeble-mindedness, of bad home training, of defective education, and of moral failure that wring his heart. But contact

[1] Lescohier, D. D.: *A Clearing-House for Labor*, Atlantic Monthly, vol. cxxi, pp. 773–783.

with tens of thousands of laborers of every type and description has forced the conclusion upon me that the moral failure of a very large percentage of these men is the result of the industrial and social conditions that surround them, rather than of initial viciousness on their part. Initial personal fault accounts for some of them. But economic conditions beyond their control or understanding account for more. They are victims of drink, vice, drugs, and women *largely because the nature of their work prevents a normal home life, normal community life, normal citizenship.*

In the same article he describes the varieties of common labor which constitute so large a part of the working population. Those who are not completely migratory, but are attached in some degree to a community, he divides into three grades: those who have relatively steady employment in a definite occupation, those whose employment is irregular and for a succession of employers, and those who are 'professional casual' workers working only a day at a time with no plan or prospect beyond the day. The first of these grades is the highest in income and situation, yet of these he says:

The members of the group with steady employment are never far from destitution. They are poor, very poor.... The wife or children may have to earn part of the living, but the family is self-supporting....

Of the second grade he continues:

The group which works at a succession of jobs, on the contrary, continually hears the wolf's claws scratching on the door. They live in constant uncertainty, constant fear. They have no assurance of continuing income, no solid basis for hope.... They are living from hand to mouth, and never know at what moment the hand may be empty.

Of purely migratory workers he says:

These Ishmaelites of the twentieth century are one of the by-products of our economic system.... We have met the needs of industry without protecting the personalities of laborers. We have developed our resources while spoiling citizens.

Beyond a doubt, as Parmelee suggests, if all men were lifted out of poverty for the time being, it would soon recur, unless some change were made in the social and economic life itself. The essential thing to remember, therefore, is that the prevention of poverty involves some modification in the distribution of wealth, and that it

is in that sense a class problem and not an individual one. Penman[1] puts this conclusion in the following statement:

> In the last analysis, then, the chief causes of poverty are to be found in the economic forces of modern society. The amount of poverty which is due to defects of character must necessarily be small. It is almost negligible as compared with the poverty which is the result of the individualism of our industrial system. As long as society is content to deal only with the effects of poverty, and to leave the causes which manufacture it unchecked and uncontrolled, we must expect to see poverty increase and multiply in this country.

Remedies suggested — charity inadequate. The efforts of society to meet poverty and the suggested methods are various; but all societies have done and do something. The most common idea is that those who have shall care for those who have not. This assumes that poverty is altogether a personal fact and is inevitable. It involves a slight change in relative incomes, but this change is to be voluntary. This is charity, and charity as a system of meeting poverty has tried to alleviate suffering, but has done little to prevent its recurrence. It rests upon sympathy, but tries at times to add scientific knowledge in the administering of its aid. It is most readily appealed to for children and others who are weak or helpless. And it should be said that some collective responsibility for these elements in society is entirely essential to a decent and wholesome life. Therefore, the most successful expressions of charity as a method of meeting poverty are in the care of children (though too often it is anything but well done) and in regard to the care of the sick and diseased. Medical-social work, looking to the curing of bodily defect or its prevention through the education of mothers, or in other similar ways, is probably the field of greatest promise in the way of sympathy as expressed through charity.

Charity is administered either as 'outdoor relief' or 'indoor relief'; by these expressions it is meant that aid to poor families is given either in their own homes or in congregate homes — asylums, poorhouses, etc. Charity is supported both by voluntary gifts and by taxation or governmental aid, and is thereby distinguished as private and public charity. Like all important activities, it may be

[1] *Poverty — the Challenge of the Church*, p. 58. The Pilgrim Press.

well or poorly carried out, and so there has been much effort spent in organizing and carefully scrutinizing expenditures of this kind, though there is still a great waste and a continuing inefficiency in much of charity administration.

Social minimum standards. In comparatively recent times, as the study of poverty has forced a recognition of its extent and its seriousness, more far-reaching proposals for its modification or abolition have been brought forward. These proposals suggest some modification — more or less thoroughgoing — in the present distribution of wealth. Those which are most extreme would completely change the present economic order of society, holding that any real improvement in economic life is impossible without such a fundamental change. The various types of socialism take this position. They advocate the collective ownership of capital in place of individual ownership. It is to be noticed, however, that such social programs are not merely plans for the reduction or elimination of poverty, but aim to bring about what is conceived to be a juster or fairer social system.

Of proposals which aim directly at the poverty problem, reform by means of the establishment of social minimum standards through legislation is strongly advocated by many. This program assumes that poverty is 'economic insufficiency.' It separates unemployable labor (those physically or mentally incapable of work) from the employable, considering the former as wards of society to be cared for directly by public philanthropy. It recognizes that real poverty (not dependency) is primarily due to the conditions of employment, as expressed in wages. Low wages and unemployment — the two go together — mean insufficient income for normal existence. By legislation, therefore, there should be a fixed minimum wage for workers of varying grades, based upon the principle that the first charge upon industry is the maintenance of its workers. Besides a minimum wage, there should be a standard of hours set by law, and in cases of unemployment because of industrial reasons an unemployment insurance fund is to be maintained by industry to tide its workers over to a period of renewed employment. Remembering also that sickness and accident are the most serious personal factors leading to family poverty, these should be met by an ade-

quate system of social insurance and compensation, by which payments are made to the injured or sick worker or his family to meet the expenses and lack of income incurred. In the same way old age is to be provided for by insurance. Unemployment, sickness, and old age are often called the 'three fears' of labor. In their place there would thus result a large degree of security, and the extreme of poverty would at the same time be removed. Other minimum standards which are needed are in industrial education and in housing. These standards, if made adequate and efficiently administered, would not remove all grades of poverty, but they would, it is thought, eliminate its most serious phases.

Other proposals. In addition to such a program, others advocate the more adequate control of monopoly, since the concentration of wealth and the inequitable distribution of wealth is quite considerably due to monopoly. Taxation may also be used as a method of redistributing wealth and so of meeting poverty. It may be applied to monopoly gains, unearned riches, inheritances, and excess profits; in all cases the purpose being to use the taxing power to restore wealth to society in so far as it has become concentrated in private ownership.

These are but suggestions of the many directions which thought is taking in regard to the life of the poor. There is clearly a close relation between the problem of poverty and the conflict which arises between capital and labor. Labor, which was once in the condition of slavery, is now legally free. But it asks for a larger share in the control of industry largely because it is dissatisfied with the tendency of wealth to be concentrated in the hands of the owners of capital. It believes, in an age in which scientific knowledge applied to industry has brought to pass the production of wealth such as previous ages never even dreamed of, that the economic life of society ought to lift workers quite above the poverty level of existence. Beyond a doubt here is perhaps the most difficult, and at the same time the most vital, of the problems which divide society and throw it into conflict and disorder.

Consequences of poverty. We must notice, finally, that the consequences of poverty are most serious, not only as an individual fact, but socially. Poverty of income becomes poverty of life; low

economic standards of living become low social standards. Poor income is the basis of inefficient workmanship. "The root of most social problems is to be found in the conditions under which people labor"; poor income entails ignorance, education becoming slight or absent altogether. It involves bad housing and consequent bad family environment and association. Crime inevitably thrives upon poverty, and vice grows in its company, not because the poor are by nature either criminal or vicious, but because the conditions of life which poverty makes are bad for body and mind, encouraging that fundamental ignorance of life and its possibilities which undermines the very basis of a fine society. Not wealth, but enough material goods to make possible for all not only bodily strength, but education and the opening of the doors of the mind and the spirit — this is the demand which society makes upon the economic order. "By peaceful and orderly methods," says a student of economics, "we must undertake to narrow the gulf between the rich and the poor as a measure of self-protection as well as of justice." [1]

READING REFERENCES

Edie, L. D.: *Principles of the New Economics*, ch. VII.
Hurry, J. B.: *Poverty and its Vicious Circle.*
Adams, H. C.: *Description of Industry*, chs. I, II, III, V, VI, XIV.
Chenery, W. L.: *Industry and Human Welfare.*
Brooks, J. G.: *The Social Unrest*, ch. VI.
Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XIII, XIV, XXXI, XXXII.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, ch. XXVI.
Hamilton, W. H.: *Readings in Current Economic Problems*, part IX.
Pound, A.: *The Iron Man in Industry.*
Hobson, J. A.: *Work and Wealth.*
Kelley, F.: *Modern Industry.*
Fairchild, H. P.: *Applied Sociology*, chs. VI, IX, X.
Devine, E. T.: *Misery and its Causes.*
Hollander, J. H.: *The Abolition of Poverty.*
Parmelee, M.: *Poverty and Social Progress.*
Gillin, J. L.: *Poverty and Dependency.*
Warner, A. G.: *American Charities.*
Tufts, J. H.: *Real Business of Living*, chs. XV–XVIII; XXII–XXIV.
Williams, J. M.: *Principles of Social Psychology*, chs. V to XI.

[1] E. D. Durand, in *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November, 1923, p. 181.

QUESTIONS

1. Explain the significance of the following quotation: "Excepting the home, it [work] is the most important social influence we have to reckon with in the formation of character." (Clay, *Economics for the General Reader*, p. 414.)
2. What has been the effect of machinery upon woman's work? Children's work?
3. Why is machinery spoken of as 'labor-saving'?
4. Does dividing work into specialized parts increase or decrease the need for skill? Does it increase or decrease production? What is its relation to monotony and to interest in work?
5. Clay says: "The great mass of workers . . . are cogs in a machine controlled by others. . . . Their work is routine . . . and routine is not educational. It kills initiative and stupefies character." (See his *Economics for the General Reader*, pp. 38–42.) Summarize in brief statement the advantages and disadvantages of machinery.
6. Find such facts as you can to illustrate the concentration of property. (Compare Taussig, *Principles of Economics*, ch. 54.)
7. What is the assumed social value of private property?
8. Does the desire to acquire wealth have the same social value that the desire to produce it does?
9. Wherein resides the value to society as a whole of the production of wealth?
10. What social evils are associated with the uneven distribution of wealth?
11. What are the purpose and justification for labor legislation?
12. Poverty is defined as 'economic insufficiency.' What are the effects of poverty upon men and women as individuals?
13. Why is poverty spoken of as a 'vicious circle?' What is the relation of sickness to poverty? Of poor employment, unemployment, or low wages to poverty? (Read Devine, *Misery and its Causes*.)
14. Is it correct to speak of poverty as 'the fundamental social evil'? Why?

CHAPTER XXVI

THE POLITICAL ORDER AND SOCIAL CONTROL

SOCIETY is always interested in the behavior of its members. The existence of all depends upon the conduct of each one. Some degree of *action-in-common* is recognized as essential to life itself, and this is impossible except through the giving-up of individual wishes or impulses for the sake of the common welfare or in deference to social judgment and social need. To bring about this unity of social life there is need of *social control — the ascendancy in influence and authority of society over the individual or subordinate groups and interests.* How to bring this about is far from easy; it constitutes one of the most difficult of arts.

Social authority and social control. The necessity of social control suggests the possibility and fact of social authority carried out through ultimate compulsion. Somewhere in social life there must be a deciding voice, an authority. The varying and conflicting elements and purposes in every society would destroy the possibility of a common, united life were there not such an authority to express the power and purpose either of the entire society or of that part whose influence is most dominant. Therefore, as societies have grown in size and developed more or less complex social relations, it has been inevitable that it should exercise authority over its members, using its power of compulsion where needed. Society organized in this way — to exercise authority resting on compulsion — is known as the State, and the machinery by which it expresses its will and carries out its purposes is government. The State and government, with the varied instruments which are used and the ideas embodied therein, constitute the *political order of society.* The political order is the most inclusive order of society; it dominates social life as a whole, and it is the final maker of social control.

Origin of government. The origin of government has been a matter of much dispute, yet it is believed by many students that government had its beginning in war. The peaceful social life of

family and kindred, resting on custom, was never an effective arrangement for warfare. As wealth accumulated, the use of force to acquire wealth began to prevail; conflicts and plundering expeditions became frequent and regular aspects of the group life; and young and adventurous men were temporarily, and often permanently, organized into fighting bands. Such men and their leaders easily acquired a dominating position and influence in social life, so that their organization, based upon force, became the ruling organization in their own society. They became a ruling class, possessors of power and wealth, controlling the lives and fortunes of the remainder of the population.

It is easy to understand how a ruling class, organized for war, could readily use force in regulating the lives of the members of its own society. Through using customs which were known to all, they could direct and order and arrange the social activities, regulating conflicting interests and compelling obedience to their commands. Thus authority within society became identified with authority in warfare, and the power to dictate and regulate the affairs of society — to 'keep order' — became the foundation of its life.

Relation of governmental development to changing economic life. Out of such unfavorable beginnings has grown modern government. It has passed through many phases, taking many forms which it is impossible for us, in so brief a study, to trace. These varying forms, however, are always closely related to the type and character of the economic life which itself has passed from stage to stage as knowledge has developed and has been applied to the production of wealth. That the characteristic features of government should change as the economic life changes is what is to be expected; the central difficulty in establishing order in society is found between conflicting economic interests. The problem of the ownership of wealth is so fundamental and so vital to the peace of society that inevitably government has assumed the rôle of arbiter and regulator of this problem. But since new discovery and invention, or contact with a different people, has continually brought into existence new economic and industrial arrangements, methods, products, and, at times, classes, government has had to change its

methods, its rules, and often its entire procedure and its very type and character. Thus, for example, the rise of manufacturing towns, in contrast with the prevailing rural life during the later middle ages, brought into existence a new type of wealth held by a new social class — the merchants. In the end there had to be a change in government to meet and adjust the conflicting problems of the new commerce and in recognition of this new social class; the feudal government, which had been adjusted to the problems of land and landowners, was inadequate; in time, therefore, feudal ideals and practices gave way to national monarchies, with the possibility of the recognition in lawmaking of the merchant class. Or, as a second illustration, we may note the tremendous changes in government which have followed the invention of the steam engine, the building of factories, of railways and steamships, and so the making of modern cities. Not only has municipal government become vastly more important and difficult; but new groups of the population have gained consideration from government as a whole — not only the 'middle class,' but the laboring class as well, whose power and influence is primarily centered in the new cities. And since women are drawn from the home into industrial plants of every kind, they also, as individuals and as a class, have received a recognition from government and a new political status. Thus, while in simple agricultural or pastoral society government was likely to be held by a single class and to represent its authority, as economic life has grown more and more complex, and as this has resulted in increasing the varieties and kinds of social classes making up our complex society, government has had to become interested in these classes and their problems, admitting them ultimately to a share in the exercise of government itself. It may, indeed, be laid down as a general political principle that *the greater the variety of classes representing varied and complex economic and other interests, the less possible is it for government to be held by a single class, and the more certain it is that all classes will have to be recognized and be given a share in the organizing and administering of government itself. It is thus that man has tended to pass from monarchical autocratic government to a democratic system.* Complete political democracy calls for the equal recognition of every group within society.

Government and the making of public opinion. All social control aims at building a unity out of diverse social elements. It is not enough that a population should exist, having similar inborn instincts and capacities. Order and system rest upon organization and grow out of common purposes, interests, and standards as expressed in organization. But as unity develops through economic life, through common social activities, common religion, common culture, there is formed also a common or *public opinion.* This public opinion tends to be expressed through government, since final authority rests in government and public opinion itself has authority. Different classes or groups, however, wish to control government in their own interests; to do this they, therefore, try to control the making and expression of public opinion. Class government is most easily brought into existence if the mass of the people is both poor and ignorant; in this case the rich and educated class is the maker of public opinion. The spread of education is the greatest means of securing democratic government, since public opinion is far less easily controlled by a class if the entire people is really educated. The people themselves then share in the making of public opinion, and government tends to become the expression of this opinion.

The problem of the control of the press. But by education must be understood not only the school, but all agencies which bring about mental contact, chief among which to-day is the press. Books, magazines, and, most of all, the newspaper, are great educational forces out of which comes the development of public opinion. Every group in society, therefore, which wishes to control government will try to control the press itself. It is this which makes the ownership of great newspapers of real political and social importance. The method of giving the news — what news to emphasize and what to treat lightly — becomes significant. Suggestion through headlines and by cartoons often sweeps over to masses of minds ideas expressing the views of a class, and thus public opinion is easily controlled. The development of the critical mind in the reading public is a highly important part of real education; upon it rests the possibility of intelligent judgment, preventing the sway of prejudiced suggestion in the making of public opinion. Fortu-

nately, there are papers which aim at careful discrimination in what they publish, journals that give both sides of questions in conflict; and the close intermingling of contending groups in city life itself compels us to recognize conflicting beliefs and to understand why they are held. Thus the very massing of many and varied interests becomes a basis of real education. Nevertheless, the control of so large a part of the press as a commercial enterprise by large corporate or individual wealth is a grave danger to the formation of enlightened public opinion and the existence of really democratic government.

Law and freedom. Government rests ultimately upon force; it expresses authority. Its justification for the use of force is that unity of life is absolutely essential to the existence of society. This does not mean that all members of society must think alike, must dress alike, must talk alike, or must do just the same things. It means only that institutions, customs, standards, and movements must be enough alike to prevent contending factions from tearing society to pieces. Order means some degree of unity, and order of some sort is the necessary foundation of all social or even individual life. But if force is to be used, it interferes with freedom, and freedom is most eagerly desired by all men. The most difficult task which rests upon government is the establishment of order without unnecessary, unwise, or unjust interference with freedom. It is not wise, evidently, to limit freedom where no great good can arise from it; it is not wise to use forcible control of men when their intelligence or their interest would lead them voluntarily to the same result. Moreover, freedom is essential to discovery, to inventiveness, to energetic activity, and upon these depends the possibility of social progress; too often in human history social stagnation has followed a period of excessive governmental interference with liberty. And finally, as a basic principle, interference with liberty should be based on justice. Most of the historic struggles for liberty are struggles against not only what is considered arbitrary, but unjust authority and force. Justice is the central principle in the political order; discontent arises from a sense of injustice. Rights, which are voiced as the basis of political struggle and often of revolutionary movements, are really demands for freedom

from restrictions which are considered unjust. The idea of equality in political and civil life rests upon the belief that justice is possible only if all conditions and kinds of men have equal rights.

On the other hand, however, without order liberty becomes impossible. This is not easily realized, and the failure to understand it is the root of much discontent. This may be seen, however, through a discussion of the meaning of law, since the chief instrument of social control which government uses is the law.

Law is a formulation of social rules enforced by penalties. These rules are constantly forbidding one or another sort of conduct or action, but their very prohibition or limitation upon action becomes the protection of each individual against interferences with his freedom by others. If it were not for law, there would be no way of restraining the arbitrary interference of one with another, and those who are strongest, through whatever reason, would utterly destroy the liberty of all others. It is the function of law to secure freedom for all, and to protect it from destruction at the hands of the violent, the ruthless, the usurper. Laws are like the rules of a game: without rules there could be no team-work, and so no game; and the man who will not be governed by the rules always spoils the game unless he is put out of it. He renders useless the right of all others to play: their initiative, their skill, their self-expression, their eager coöperation, and their delight in the approval of their fellows are taken away by the action of the man who believes that the rules (the law) interfere with his freedom to act as he pleases.

Society is not just a number of individuals. It is a series of interrelated activities and influences, a system of understandings, of mutual standards, agreements, and rules. Part of these are laws, prescribed by government and enforced by penalties. If they did not exist, anarchy and mutual destruction would follow; liberty would not be gained, it would be destroyed.

Government and the lawless use of force. To use compulsion to gain their will is a constant temptation to men. It is therefore both necessary and fortunate that its use should be restricted to government. Government, it may be said, has a monopoly upon

the use of bodily force in carrying out its purposes. If groups other than the State through its government can compel men to obedience, civil strife and mutual destruction are likely to follow. Therefore, in the process of the growth of ideas of human relation it has come to be a firm maxim that government alone may compel. In the end this makes the political order the most inclusive order of society; it sets the rules as between the various interests which tend to struggle against each other, and it prescribes the fields which are open to each group within which it is free to order its own life. From time to time, however, there arise organized interests which assume to lay down rules and compel men to obey them. They are not able, apparently, to gain their will through law; and so, under cover of secrecy, they attempt to gain their purposes by illegal use of force. Such movements are always of extreme danger to the life of organized society. No matter if the motives be to bring about worthy objects, the breakdown of law and the destruction of freedom are bound to follow. The use of force by irresponsible persons is always dangerous to freedom and to justice; the only wise way is to concentrate its use in government and to make government as responsible an expression of public opinion as is possible. Organizations which use force under the cover of secrecy, violence in industry resorted to by either capital or labor, lynching mobs expressing race hatreds, are examples of the most serious of dangers to orderly society; they are the lawless seizure of force by irresponsible persons, and lawlessness always strikes at the foundations of society, which rests on the values which are created by law.

Law and individual obligation. Law, then, regulates the relations between men and groups in society, and it tends to express the opinion and will of society. It is, moreover, utterly necessary that there should be law if there is to be liberty. Two consequences follow from these facts: one is that each individual shares in the moral obligation to maintain the law, and the other is that because laws are often neither wise nor just, the possibility of changing them should not be too difficult.

In regard to the first, let it be remembered that law confers rights. Many of the most important rights which men share are embodied

in fundamental laws of the several nations. Through them men enjoy safety and protection from irresponsible and arbitrary interferences and even ultimate destruction. The constitutions of American States contain such laws as guarantees or bills of rights. These rights could not be upheld were they not embodied in law. Nor could such simple rights as the right to life itself, or the right to property, be maintained except through law. Law is thus, therefore, the basis of the possibility of a protected and satisfactory life. But it is one thing to enjoy these rights and another to see that others equally share them. And to enjoy such of them as suit the will of the individual, but to refuse to support others which he does not like, is to make government a mockery. Rights alone are not a sufficient basis for a settled social order; the only possible basis for such an order is the conscious recognition by each individual of his obligation to make the observance of law a reality, even though the law may at times fail to accord with his personal wishes and interests.

Need of easy methods of changing law. But if law is to express justice, it must be easily changed, since the conditions and relations within society are in constant change. Invention and discovery arise, industry develops new tools and new arrangements, populations are constantly shifting, making new groups. Change is constant, so that laws which are just at one time, too frequently become unjust and arbitrary under changing conditions. Moreover, the work of governing society is a constant experiment; many experiments prove failures, and others need to be tried. Hence it is that it should not be too difficult to change the law. It is to be said that the more fundamental the law, the less readily should it be changed; yet even in regard to the underlying law (which states the principles of government itself, and is therefore called constitutional), the need for change must be recognized. Too often revolution has been the answer to an unchangeable body of law.

Rights essential to democratic government. In regard to the relation between freedom and order, one other principle of action is of importance. There are certain aspects of the freedom of the individual, which, as a general principle, should not be interfered with or limited by government. These are the so-called 'rights' which

make possible the formation and expression of opinion: freedom of belief, of speech, and of assemblage. These freedoms are necessary if each individual and each interest or group in society is to count in the making of public opinion. To make public opinion really representative of society is extremely difficult; if there be no freedom to form or express opinions, a real public opinion is impossible; instead, government rests upon class opinion. The trend of all governments which are really democratic in spirit is away from class opinion toward public opinion. But both education and freedom of expression must exist to make this real. Moreover, it is only by the clash of conflicting opinions in discussion that new ideas are developed and progress toward better social organization made possible.

Government and industry. It may be laid down as a general principle that the more complex the life of society, the more necessary is it that government establish rules regulating the relationships between men. Particularly is this true of industry, since so large a part of the conflicting struggles and ambitions of men have to do with it. Just as increasing traffic on the highway has led to the enactment of traffic rules unnecessary in pre-automobile days, so industry and resulting massed city social conditions have compelled government to regulate by legislation first one aspect and then another of this complex economic and social life. It is natural that opinions should be divided in regard to such legislation, many believing that government should have as little as possible to do with industry, while others reach the conclusion that, unless society expresses its will in laws regulating industry more or less minutely, the consequences to society will be destructive. It is fair to state that the evident trend of modern legislation is toward greater and greater control of industry in the interest of society as a whole. The increasing complexity of social life and its industry, and the growing power of concentrated wealth, seem to make this essential to the welfare of the people. Ross well says:[1]

By protecting patrons and consumers from negligence and fraud, by attacking working conditions inimical to health and morals, by excluding from the factories children of tender years, by limiting the hours and fixing

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 592, 593. The Century Co.

a legal minimum wage for working-women, by providing for the amicable adjustment of industrial disputes which threaten the continuous operation of public utilities, organized society here and there is projecting its deliberate will into the field of industry and business.... If we may judge the course of the future from that of the past, society will become constantly more attentive to evils in the field of industry, more solicitous that the health of young working-women shall not be broken down by setting them at tasks involving too great physical strain, that boys shall not stagnate and lose heart in blind-alley jobs, that homes fit to rear children in shall be available for the workers, that the discipline of the shop shall not be such as to affront the self-respect of the working citizen, that wage-earners shall not be goaded to desperation by wanton and unredressed wrong, that inequality of bargaining power shall not be used to switch product from wages to profits, that what the capitalist takes out of the business shall not be out of all proportion to the value of his services to society.... The progressively capitalistic character of production and the increasing size of production units are translating industry from the sphere of the individual to the sphere of society.

From regulation to administration. Thus far government has been described as regulating the relations within society. But there are some fields of life in which legal regulation does not seem to be adequate for social need. Private effort regulated by law sometimes defeats social welfare; in such cases governments have become directly administrative; that is, they take over from private organizations the problems in question and become themselves the organizers and performers of the social service involved. In doing this the government directly serves the community and the State. A city fire department is a public organization managed by the municipal government. City water-works, lighting plants, and street railways are other illustrations of the same sort. So the post-office system, the mint in which money is coined, many types of engineering enterprises such as irrigation enterprises or road-building, and in some countries the railways and telegraphs, are other examples on a large scale. Here is one of the most difficult and bitter controversies of our day. The traditions of earlier society are favorable to private management, but the increasing populations and more complex organization of society make it more and more difficult to serve the needs of society by private efforts under regulation; and where the service is a vital one and tends easily to

become a monopoly, the resulting power over society is too great to remain in private hands. Thus gradually is society driven to use government for both control and administration of its major public service industries. The trend is definitely in this direction.

Of a somewhat different character is the direct administration by government of undertakings in which private effort has not engaged or does so ineffectively. Communities, and at times nations, are discovering that there are many things which they need to do for their own welfare which private individuals have not thought worth while or which lead to evil if carried on for profit. Community playgrounds and swimming-beaches, municipal, county, and state hospitals, geological surveys by State and Nation, the establishment of agricultural bureaus, are illustrations. The public school system as a whole is the largest and most important of such undertakings, made necessary in order that the whole child population may be brought in touch with education.

Lessening of governmental control in certain fields of life. On the other hand, there are other fields of social life from which government has tended to withdraw. Most important of these is religion. Earlier societies placed their religious organization and ceremonies under the direct control of the government. The law as well as custom prescribed both religious belief and religious practice. The change which has come about in this respect is remarkable. In the United States freedom in religion from political control is an accepted principle, and the support of religious institutions is voluntary and private instead of compulsory and public. This change is due to a gradual recognition that the effort to regulate religion by the State has led to conflicts most harmful to social order. It has been realized that unity in belief and worship is not essential to the order of society, and this came particularly to be true as the spirit of religious toleration grew, since toleration is acceptance of difference in belief which does not become destructive. Force in this field, therefore, need not be used; and it may be added that government and law are not likely to be relied upon in *any* field in which difference of opinion does not lead the contending groups to try to settle their difference by force. But if force is relied upon, then government, as the ultimate user of force for society as a whole, enters the field and controls by law.

The trend toward democracy. A clear distinction must be made between governments and societies. Governments are spoken of as either autocratic or democratic. Societies also vary in respect to the degree of democracy which characterizes them. But a democratic political order does not necessarily correspond with a democratic social order. A democratic political order (government) responds accurately and quickly to the will of the people; it may or may not act wisely or justly. Democracy in society, on the other hand, is a vaguer idea, less easily expressed, but more far-reaching in its reaction upon social life as a whole. It seems to imply a society so organized that the individuality of every one and of every group is respected; to every one is given such opportunities as are essential to his best development. It is, therefore, opposed to privileged groups or individuals; its standards must find approval in the will and the hope of the people as a whole. In the long run the making of the standards of society is its most important work. Such standards as economic justice, educational opportunity, sound health, vigorous moral habits and ideals, reasonable leisure, can arise only in a society in which real democracy prevails. Without such democratic standards a democratic form of government tends to be a formal shell and without vital power. But a society with such democratic standards inevitably tends to establish a democratic government through which to express its political life. It is, therefore, true that the quality or character of the society itself is, in the end, always of greater consequence than the form of its government, important as the latter always is.

Limitations upon governmental control under autocratic rule may work badly in a democracy. Autocratic governments always express the control of power by a class. In origin, usually a military class rules; this may become later a landowning or a capitalist class. Whatever conditions of birth or wealth or prestige confer governmental privilege upon a whole rank or order of society tend to place government in the hands of a few as against the rule of the many. The ignorance of the masses of mankind has tended, also, to make easy the rule of the privileged orders. But the history of governments reveals a movement away from arbitrary class rule in the direction of democratic government. The first efforts in this di-

rection were not aimed toward giving the people a share in government, but rather toward establishing definite limitations upon the power of the autocratic and arbitrary government. Such limitations as that property shall not be taken without just compensation, that the freedom of the individual entitles him to a trial by his equals, that taxes must be levied only with the consent of the representatives of the people, and other like limitations have their origin in a struggle by the people, or some part of them, to restrict the unrestrained and arbitrary actions of an autocratic government. Under such circumstances government has tended naturally to be looked upon as tyranny and its interference as an evil. But as governments have come more and more to express the will of the people — to be simply the community or the nation doing things for itself — this situation has entirely changed; and often individuals or corporations are able to defeat the expressed will of the people's government by relying upon some principle of limitation placed upon government in the age when it represented arbitrary class rule.

Is democracy a failure? The 'failure of democracy' is a phrase which is often used; and it is not difficult to see that the evolution of societies toward political democracy has not necessarily improved their entire social life. Societies are more than governments; government is but one instrument which society uses. If government rests upon the will of the people, there is less likelihood of its being unjust or expressive of the ambitions of a single class. Yet it may be both ignorant and foolish. There is no way to prevent this except through the education of the people in regard to their own social life, and through more intelligent and self-sacrificing leadership — a leadership not bound by narrow class lines, but loyal to the best standards and highest interests of society as a whole. The opportunity and demand for such leadership is without limit.

Democracy as a whole is not merely the rule of the people; it is "the rule of the many *with standards.*" Political democracy is of value in proportion to the ability of the forms of government to express standards which the people — 'the many' — make for themselves. 'Standards' represent levels of approval or judgment which are accepted and which govern conduct; if such standards

have their origin in a society based upon class privilege, they do not fit the needs of a democratic society. But it is not easy to change standards; so that every political order, however democratic in form, falls short of justice because different groups have very unequal prestige before the law or in public esteem. In a study of American courts of justice, R. H. Smith reaches the conclusion that the poor have much less chance of receiving justice than the rich, since legal justice depends in part upon the amount of money which can be spent in obtaining it; and this startling conclusion is concurred in by the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Taft.[1]

The problem of equality. Thus democracy implies a government responsive to the will of the people — what is commonly called 'self-government' — and also a condition of society which rests on equality. The idea of equality does not imply that individuals are equal in natural abilities or characters, though it has often been thought to suggest this. 'Equality' is a social term and standard, defining a state or type of society; it is an assertion of a principle on which society *should be* based. It denies the reasonableness of organizing society in the interests of privileged groups, thereby permitting these groups to dominate the lives of others. It asserts that every individual should have the opportunities which will enable him to develop his life; this is the ideal of a just society. To carry out this ideal, political equality is essential; this phase of equality is that which has received most attention and which has played the biggest part in history. But political equality is only one aspect of general equality; civil equality — or equality before the law and in civil rights — is also essential. And to this must be added, also, industrial and social equality, through which opportunities for all kinds and types of men may come into existence.

Democratic government does not, therefore, insure wisdom nor efficiency nor justice; but it does make the way easier for the development of a democratic society, one in which there is respect for the life of each individual, and opportunity — educational and social — is provided for each, without special privilege, but simply as a matter of justice and right. This is the best value that demo-

[1] Smith, R. H.: *Justice and the Poor*, Introduction.

cratic government can give; it is not an end in itself, but is an instrument to be used for bringing about that state and condition of society which is an ideal, but which, as a social ideal, directs the energies and builds the hopes of mankind.

National and world political order. Governments represent societies; but what societies shall organize governments? Early societies, made on the basis of kinship, organized tribal governments. Later, territorial societies, living in agricultural village groups, organized local governments which eventually, as villages, traded with each other and, as populations expanded, became national governments. But in recent times the interchange of life disregards even national lines. Commerce is world-wide; labor moves from country to country; capital is invested with scant regard to the nationality of the investor; science, knowledge, discovery, are spread about the world by the varied means of communication; ideals and standards are imitated from one end of the earth to the other. Socially speaking, societies are more and more disregarding national lines; but as yet governments remain national. This is the seat of much of the world's terrible political disorder. No way has been found by which conflicting national governments may settle their conflicts except by war, since war is the instrument of conflict used by political units which have no restraining political relations with each other. Yet there is developing a world social life, made up of common activities, industrial and cultural, with purposes and standards which can be expressed *only by a single world political order*. Societies are spreading and intermingling regardless of national lines, but governments lag behind, expressing as yet only national societies. The use of force to maintain political order within national groups has been centered in national government; there is no other way to prevent internal conflict and anarchy. The great need of the world to-day is evidently an international government to maintain a world political order based upon world social intercourse and life. Without it disorder and destruction are inevitable. It is difficult to designate what should be the character of this government, except that, obviously, in an increasingly democratic world it must be democratic. But it is clear that just as all other problems and all other possibilities of social progress hinge

upon the existence of a social order with a political system as a basis, so, in the growing interrelations of the life of the world, progress and even safety is halted or destroyed by the failure to work out a governmental basis for a world social order. It is the great political problem of our age.

Crime and social control. Always there is more or less of conflict between society and its individual members. Individuals wish to be free to follow their own desires, but safety and survival of all depend on group united action. Because of this, social control arises, which is the effort of society so to impress its will as to bring about social behavior on the part of the individual and to eliminate anti-social behavior. In early societies custom, including morals and religion, is the first basis of social control; later, public opinion also comes into existence; and ultimately social control becomes centralized in the State and its government, and is expressed through law. The machinery of control most relied on, in the end, is the law.

Acts or behavior considered harmful to society, if forbidden by law, are deemed crimes. By enacting laws society has undertaken to say to its individual members what acts are crimes, and it has organized elaborate machinery to carry out or enforce the laws against those who break the law. This machinery involves a police force, a court system to determine who is guilty of the crime and what the crime is, and a penal system to punish the convicted criminal. All of this is enormously expensive; society would not incur this expense were it not believed that it is a necessity for the sake of maintaining order.

Theories of punishment and prevention. In its efforts to secure from individuals the behavior that it wishes, society relies upon punishment; in other words, the law is based upon compulsion, and compulsion is made up of threats and punishment resting on fear. Society is not very gentle in gaining its will; it is not considerate of the feelings nor the weakness of men; it is harsh and often cruel. All of this needs to be kept in mind in understanding the development of criminal law and the methods of punishment used.

Punishment has always carried with it something of the thought of revenge: injury must be met by injury. In addition to revenge,

the thought of deterring men from the commission of crimes through fear is also involved. On the basis of these two ideas most criminal law has developed, leading to methods of punishment which are often cruel and even barbarous. The savage attacks upon men suspected of anti-social acts by lynching mobs is an expression of the same ideas and motives: revenge and intimidation — revenge upon the man who has committed the act, and intimidation or deterrence of others who might otherwise commit similar acts. As a consequence of this theory, penalties have tended to be very severe, so that it is true of the criminal law of different countries that until well into the nineteenth century the number of offenses for which death was the penalty reached many hundreds. Little difference was made, either, between men and women or young and old. Yet severity did not deter from crime, nor were crimes fewer where punishment was most severe; for crime results from conditions which are often, at least, out of the reach of the influence of punishment. Punishment is an effort to discipline individuals, based on fear. But many motives govern conduct, and many influences turn it one way or another. Though fear may influence certain types of mind under certain circumstances, it cannot be relied on to discipline character with certainty. Too often it becomes itself the basis of anti-social behavior through rousing the anger and hatred of those who are punished. Hence the failure of the harsh prison discipline, the abuse and cruelties of which abound in the record of prison history.

In recent years there has developed a different view of punishment. The theory of education and reform as its purpose is more and more accepted by thoughtful men and women. With a better understanding of human nature, with its varying inborn mental capacities and characteristics, and an acquaintance with the conditions of society in which men must live, there has grown an appreciation of the temptations which beset men. To-day we recognize that crime is a measure of the failure of education; it is an indictment of the evil conditions of society in which crime thrives. It is more important to prevent crime than to punish it; and the object of punishment should be to restore the criminal to normal life in society where that is possible, and, where impossible, to restrain

him, but without cruelty or abuse. Punishment, therefore, should not aim at revenge, nor should its single object be intimidation and deterrence. It should aim to develop manhood, to arouse new interests, to build new life and character. In this way a discipline may develop which is vital and strong, since it grows from within the life itself and results from enlarging and better interests in substitution for anti-social ones. Probation and parole systems, the indeterminate sentence, trade education, recreation and prisoner self-government plans, are experimental phases of this newer conception of punishment.

Social conditions as a cause of crime. The census of the United States tells us that during 1910 493,934 persons were committed to the penal institutions of the country: 24,974 were juvenile delinquents; and of the total number 445,431 were males and 48,503 were females. Evidently the amount of crime in our country is large.

Crime varies in amount with conditions of society. The law is but one of the instruments of social control of individuals; custom, morals, religion, family instruction, are important also. Influences which modify these instruments will lead to change in the amount of crime. The changes in the family as an institution which have already been described, the weakening of custom through the mingling of diverse people of many origins in restless city masses, the lack of interest in the institutions of religion characteristic of the present day, and the increasing complexity of society itself, are bound to show their effect in an increase of crime. That there is such an increase is beyond doubt, though it is impossible to measure it accurately. It is found especially in cities where wealth is centered and where it is easy for the criminal to disappear from view. The city, too, tends to weaken in many minds the sense of moral responsibility, since people who do not know each other easily lose a regard for the community or neighborhood opinions and standards of conduct. For the young the weakening of the family and the failure of the neighborhood are especially important aspects of the social environment as causes of the marked increase in juvenile crime. Together with the change in these institutions, the introduction of automatic machinery has opened work to youth so that now there

are increasing numbers of occupations in which the highest earning period is from seventeen to twenty-five years of age; it is suggestive, at least, that these are the years of greatest criminality also.

On the other hand, poverty is a fundamental source of crime, because it is the basis of bad housing, bad association, lack of education, and the unsatisfied temptations which the growing wealth of the world flaunts in the face of eager and expanding life. Periods of unemployment are usually accompanied by an increase in crime; and upward movements of prices, particularly of goods essential to life, or downward movements of wages, seem to lead to a higher percentage of crime. Poverty, too, is an important cause of intemperance which itself is a cause of many crimes. Speaking of the professional criminal, Parmelee writes:

> To put it still more concretely, it is economic pressure in early youth in the form of a struggle for existence or for a higher standard of living, and resulting usually in inadequate intellectual and moral training and association with bad companions, which forces or, to say the least, leads many of these professional criminals into their first crimes. Many of these would never pass beyond occasional criminality were it not for the corrupting influence of the prisons, most of which are training schools for crime and make many of these beginning criminals into full-fledged professionals.

Again he says:

> It goes without saying that forces for crime and intemperance are to be found everywhere in human society. But there is no doubt that the conditions of the poor stimulate both of these evil tendencies. . . . The prevalence of disease, crime, and certain kinds of vice is stimulated by poverty, and as all of these evils are more or less contagious, their prevalence is by no means limited to the poor themselves.[1]

Among other social conditions which lead to crime, companionship is extremely important, particularly in relation to play or recreation. It is for this reason that there is great need for society to provide suitable opportunities as well as direction of recreation both for youth and for adults. Recreation is very commonly upon a low or crude level and easily leads to vice; but particularly is this true because recreation-companionship is irresponsible and without dis-

[1] Parmelee, M.: *Criminology*, pp. 86 and 89. The whole of Chapter VI on "The Economic Basis of Crime" is of great value. Copyright, by The Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

ciplined habits based upon good moral or intellectual standards. The immediate reduction in juvenile delinquency in neighborhoods in which playgrounds have been opened has been observed and recorded many times.

The press, especially the daily newspaper, is also at times an influence toward crime. The sensational advertising of crimes and the criminal becomes a suggestion of crime to many, particularly those who are uneducated or weak. That crime description forms too large a part of the daily news and that it is often made enticing or fascinating rather than repellent is a charge against irresponsible papers which has much of truth in it. The same charge is often true of moving pictures, also. Immature and ignorant minds are particularly susceptible to such suggestion.

Heredity and crime. Not only does crime vary with social conditions; it is dependent also upon the inborn nature. The study of psychology has thrown much light upon the individual mental causes of criminality. Differences in natural ability and impulse-tendencies lead individuals to react differently to similar social environments. Thus criminality has its individual basis as well as its social. It has been common to speak of 'the born' criminal, the idea being that some persons are so born that criminality is to be expected from them. The study of the mind of criminals does not seem, however, to justify this assumption. But it is undoubtedly true that persons born with weak or unbalanced minds are more likely to commit crime. They are more easily led by others, are less able to control their passions, and are not so able to act as intelligent and responsible individuals. Therefore, abnormal mind is a definite cause of crime and calls for special treatment, since the sheer inability of such persons to care for themselves in ordinary social conditions suggests the need of their segregation, by finding for them a protected environment, both for the safety of society and of themselves. How large a proportion of crime is due to defective mind, it is impossible to say. The tendency to exaggerate this per cent appears in some of the studies on this problem. Goddard concludes from a study of a considerable number of reformatories that an "estimate of fifty per cent [as of defective mind] is well within the limit. From these studies we might conclude that at

least fifty per cent of all criminals are mentally defective."[1] Parmelee criticizes this conclusion as "wholly unjustifiable," and the studies by other criminologists do not support so large an estimate. Bronner concludes, from an examination of 505 boys and girls in the Detention House of the Juvenile Court in Chicago, that "we find the percentage of feeble-mindedness to be less than ten per cent, while the group of those normal in ability exceeds ninety per cent."[2] Other estimates upon selected groups in reformatories or prisons range from five per cent upward to thirty-five or more. It is to be remembered that a large number of criminals escape arrest, and these are likely to be the ones of greater mental ability, so that estimates of feeble-mindedness in prison populations are sure to be much higher than the per cent existing among criminals as a whole. Parmelee believes that "the number [of feeble-minded in the entire criminal population] ranges somewhere between five and ten per cent, but this is not much more than a guess."[3]

Insanity is also a type of mental abnormality which leads to crime, and the same is true of many neuroses. These are all diseased conditions of the mind which reveal themselves in heightened passion, emotional overexcitement, lack of self-control, or lowered intellectual capacity. Crime may result the more readily from any of such characteristics.

Degenerative habits as causes of crime. Besides inborn abnormal mental characteristics, bad or degenerative habits are prolific causes of crime. Parmelee says:

> Certain bad habits give rise to aberrational mental states which lead to criminal conduct. The most important of these habits are alcoholism, and several drug habits. These habits lead to anti-social conduct in various ways, namely, by lessening the power of inhibition, by stimulating irresistible impulses, by giving rise to hallucinations and delusions, and in many other ways.[4]

The Committee of Fifty in a study of 13,402 convicts concluded that the use of alcohol was the principal cause of their crime in 31.18

[1] Goddard: *Feeble-Mindedness*, p. 9. The Macmillan Co.
[2] *Journal of Criminal Law* (November, 1914), p. 568.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 170.
[4] Parmelee: *Criminology*, p. 178.

per cent of the cases. Other students consider alcohol as a main cause of crime at a considerably higher percentage. Sullivan considers that it is the cause of sixty per cent of homicides in England. The use of habit-forming drugs seems to be increasing with dangerous rapidity; it is constantly associated with crime; the criminal of thoroughly 'perverted' mind is usually a drug addict.

It is not alone, however, the positively bad habits which lead to crime.

> More serious in causing crime [says E. C. Hayes] than any of the more positive and specific acquired traits is the negative failure to have developed the general adjustment to orderly and civilized life which we have called normal second nature, and which includes the four traits . . . : honesty; temperance, in the broad sense; steadiness in effort; and justice. The hardened criminal has acquired instead a second nature of toughened maladjustment to normal civilized existence.[1]

Punishment may increase crime. It is an unfortunate fact that the efforts of society in the way of social control often end in increasing the very evil which they are designed to cure. Thus in the field of punishment the jail and penitentiary have become important causes of crime. The county jail is a place of idleness where those who are most hardened in crime often teach the younger criminals and the impressionable first offenders; it is an efficient 'school of crime.' Most commonly those who are detained there for from one to three months have absolutely nothing to do; there is no work and there is no discipline through either industry or education, and there is no recreation. Suspicion and often cruelty take the place of normal human relations, leading to suppressed anger and hatred on the part of the criminal, rather than a desire to change his conduct.

For convenience criminals may be classified into types, though no classification suggested is very satisfactory. Perhaps as good a classification as any is: (1) Criminals of abnormal mind; (2) habitual or professional criminals, and (3) occasional criminals.

Improvement of education and social conditions essential. In conclusion it may be said that social control by law and punishment is necessary for the safety of society, but punishment should

[1] E. C. Hayes: *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, p. 603. D. Appleton & Co.

look toward restoration of the offender to normal social life. This is essentially a problem of restraint and education in the large sense; and should include industry and industrial training, with pay for work, to be used, if need be, for the family of the convict; intellectual education to arouse new interests; recreation, and such moral education as may result from at least some degree of self-government and responsibility. Cruel and revengeful punishments should be prohibited, and this should include the death penalty which continues to hold a place in penal law, not because it is successful in deterring men from crime, but in response to anger and hatred. Swifter action on the part of the courts, and more certain punishment, is probably much more effective in preventing crime than is severity. More important than any form of punishment is the effort on the part of society to prevent crime by a modification of the social conditions in which it thrives. To remove abnormal persons from unfavorable social environments is a first step; and to control and modify those social conditions and relations through which associations are made and habits are formed, is of even greater importance. Every society is its own judge, both in the standards it sets which determine what acts it will call criminal and in the character of its punishments.

READING REFERENCES

Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology*, ch. XVI.
Follett, M. P.: *The New State.*
Hadley, A. T.: *Freedom and Responsibility.*
Hadley, A. T.: *Standards of Public Morality*, chs. I and V.
Hadley, A. T.: *Undercurrents in American Politics*, lecture VI.
Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XXI and XXXIII.
Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, chs. XIII and XIV.
Giddings, F. H.: *Elements of Sociology*, chs. XXII and XXIV.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to Study of Sociology*, part IV, ch. XXIX.
Jordan, D. S.: *Democracy and World Supremacy.*
Mecklin, J. M.: *Introduction to Social Ethics*, chs. I and XXII.
Mill, J. S.: *On Liberty.*
Russell, Bertrand: *Why Men Fight*, ch. II.
Tufts, J. H.: *Our Democracy.*
Williams, J. M.: *Principles of Social Psychology*, ch. XII.
Wilson, Woodrow: *The Road away from Revolution.*
Parmelee, M.: *Criminology.*
Osborn, T. M.: *Society and Prisons.*

Wines, F. H.: *Punishment and Reformation.*
Aschaffenburg, G.: *Crime and its Repression.*
Healy, W.: *The Individual Delinquent.*

QUESTIONS

1. What is the relation of law to custom?
2. What is the relation of law to public opinion?
3. Why is law spoken of as an instrument of social control? What is controlled?
4. What are the methods by which the law brings about control? Does any other instrument or agency of control use the same methods?
5. Compare the causes of crime which are found in society with those arising in the individual.
6. Why are delinquent children treated by a different system from adults? What is a Juvenile Court and how does it work?
7. What ground is there for the assertion that crime is increasing in the United States?
8. What is a Public Defender and why is there such an officer? What is the purpose of 'Legal Aid' societies. (Read Smith, R. H.: *Justice and the Poor.*)
9. What objections are there to the county jail?
10. Compare and describe different theories of punishment as found in prisons.
11. Is national unity altogether dependent upon law?
12. Is variety of opinion greater or less within a nation in time of peace or war? Why?
13. What is political reactionism? Political conservatism? Liberalism?
14. Is there a difference between a responsive government and an efficient government? Explain.
15. Which of these (Question 14) is especially implied in the idea of democratic government?
16. "Democracy is the rule of the many with standards." What is meant by 'standards'? How are they made?
17. In the development of society is one social group rather than another accepted as the proper one to use compulsion? Why not permit every group to do so? Has the growth of freedom anything to do with this?
18. Does citizenship in a democracy give one rights? Does it suggest duties also? Explain.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE MORAL ORDER AND SOCIAL CONTROL

THE control of individual behavior by means of government and law based on punishment is not adequate to make a strong and united social life. While such means are necessary, they lead to deceit, and too frequently fail to produce more than unwilling or perfunctory conformity to the will of society. In order that social life may be really and strongly bound together, there must be a body of *principles of conduct* which are accepted and approved by society and by the individual as well. These principles constitute what are called moral standards; they are statements of actions which *ought* to, rather than *must*, prevail. Even laws lose much of their power over men unless they are believed to be in accordance with what is right — that is, with the moral standards of our society.

Social control through standards of conduct. The problem of adjusting men to one another leads each society to establish certain usages or ways of action which meet its approval. These usages get fixed in custom and are framed in codes of conduct. From the point of view of society they are ways or types of conduct which lead to social welfare, and which, therefore, it believes should be followed by each individual. Taken together, they constitute the standards which society values; and because social welfare is essential to individual life, society expects its members to share in the approval of these standards and in the conduct to which they lead. On the part of the individual these usages or ways are values which usually have been taught him in childhood; they are a part of the heritage of the past, and they express the influence and persuasive power of the great social life he shares. To him they are likely, therefore, to speak with the authority of a moral command; they are built into his mind as his own approvals; they become the voice of conscience, telling him what he ought and what he ought not to do and be.

Social standards and values shape individual character. This gradual development in the individual of a moral character is in part the result of the fact that each one of us desires the approval of his fellows. To gain this approval, we follow the ways which our group values; and society, knowing that we all wish social approval, often makes its approval and disapproval definite and distinct by forms of praise or blame, such as titles, distinctions, ranks, or ridicule, aversion, and ostracism. Thus, through the desire for social approval, and through the making by society of standards which lead to social welfare, there is built up a recognition that certain principles of conduct are right and others are wrong. The more fundamental of them become the public conscience; and as children grow up these same beliefs and principles are built into their individual consciences. The result is that men are governed and controlled, not only by government and the fear of punishment, but also by a sense of obligation, a belief in what is right, a recognition of man's duty, a feeling of responsibility for the common social life. Government and the law try to discipline the individual by compulsion and through fear. The moral order tries to discipline by building an interest in the service of social welfare through moral standards.

Traditional standards versus reflection. In describing the moral standards of society as usages or ways, it is intended to suggest that they come to each of us as social custom, and we, as creatures of habit, tend to become adjusted to them and to make them *our* customs. It is, therefore, true that they may have no strong hold upon us. Though they control us, our assent to them may be only formal, external, and for the sake of the approval which conformity brings us. It is only when these standards become more than custom that they really form an individual's character so that his conduct can be counted upon. This deepening of the moral life results from reflection, through enlarged understanding of the consequences to society of good and evil conduct, and through the embodiment of high moral ideals and character in individual men whose qualities and life stand out and arouse the admiration of others. Since it is true that new human life is being born at every moment of time, the teaching of moral ideas, through explanation,

experience, and example, is continuously necessary. It cannot once for all be learned that a society based on truth, justice, and honesty is a stronger and happier society than one which is without these standards of conduct. Again and again must this be taught, and the need will never end. If the need is not met, the level of conduct is sure to fall, and in the end society itself must decay. A society is fortunate, therefore, which has great moral teachers whose understanding of the meaning of moral life arouses the admiration and influences the life of successive generations of men. Such men help to lift and establish moral standards for whole societies; just as men of science give to society discoveries in the knowledge and control of nature, so the gift of moral teachers is a better understanding of the moral basis of society. And since men are more easily influenced by high ideals if they are embodied in the personal conduct of individual men, the greatest moral teachers are those whose character itself is a continuous illustration of their teaching. Abraham Lincoln is such an influence in American life. So was Socrates among the Greeks; King Alfred and John Hampden among the English; and Jesus in the life of the Christian world.

Variation in standards. Standards of conduct differ among societies. Because societies are all alike in some respects, it is to be expected that the standards of conduct will have some things in common, and such is found to be the case; for instance, most societies at least forbid murder and theft. But their differences are as marked as their resemblances. As they differ in knowledge, in government, and in industrial technique, so they differ in moral standards. The building of moral standards is as much a growth as is the evolution of knowledge. A warlike society emphasizes courage as the foremost virtue in its standard or code of morals, while a commercial-industrial society emphasizes honesty. Each social group is likely also to limit the application of its standard to its own members and to recognized types of action: the 'knightly' code of morals applied only to the nobility; among the Homeric Greeks deceit and theft were immoral only if practiced against the members of their own clan or tribe. The gradual enlargement of society, its growing inclusion of greater numbers and varieties of peoples, tends to enlarge the reach of moral standards. Tribal moral standards

become national standards, and the day is at hand when the social conscience of mankind will approve or disapprove conduct without regard to differences of race or nation or class. Such, indeed, has been the teaching of the greatest moral leaders of all ages, and is especially true of Christian moral ideals.

In the same way there has been a growth in the understanding of what acts are to be recognized as illustrating a particular standard. To savage man murder meant killing a man by violent physical means. To build a tenement or factory without fire-escapes may result in many deaths, and to-day we begin to hold the owner of such a building as guilty of murder as the man with the bludgeon.

What moral standards do. Moral ideals and standards are essential to the life of every society. Through them individuals are held to a higher level of social conduct than would otherwise be possible. It is not the superiority of the inborn nature of one people over another which places it on a higher level; it is the superiority of its moral control through finer and more efficient standards. As Ross says:

> The effective social standards constitute, as it were, a trestle by means of which a people rises farther and farther above the plane of its instincts. If the higher standards were broken down, it would sink to the barbarian level. If all gave way, it would find itself on the moral plane of savages. There is no reason to suppose that our original nature is appreciably better than that of our Neolithic ancestors. If we behave much better than they did, it is owing to the influence of the social standards we are reared in.[1]

Building standards. That standards of conduct are themselves far from perfect becomes apparent when it is recognized that they have all gone through many changes. That they are not better is due to ignorance and to class selfishness or exclusiveness. Standards are built by those whose influence is greatest. If these are both wise and socially minded, the standards are fine; whereas if leaders are ignorant in regard to the consequences of conduct upon social welfare, or through class pride or selfish interest are unwilling to recognize social obligation and justice, the standards may be expected to be none too high. Thus slavery was long accepted as socially just by a slave-holding class, but its harmfulness

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, p. 565. The Century Company.

to society has finally been recognized and the standard has changed. The 'double standard' of sex morality belongs to a society in which men as a class have dominated; with the rise of women to equality, the double standard is being strongly criticized. A very important part of the work of society is, therefore, the criticism and improvement of its standards. This is necessary in order to make them actively efficient and to lift them to a high level. Without constant criticism and readaptation to social needs and conditions, they tend to become dead and without power to control conduct.

Inner and outer control. Regard for the approval of our society may take two forms: one shows itself in mere external conformity to the customary standards which society has established and which are expressed in public opinion. The other, the result usually of early teaching or the influence of admired examples as shown in personal character, is woven into the inner nature of the individual; his approvals are spontaneous, his conduct is itself expressive of the character which his relations with society have built within him. The first of these two forms is a control of the individual by society similar, though more intimate, to that which is exercised by government and the law. It becomes weak whenever it is possible to escape the immediate hope or fear of social approval or disapproval, and is more governed by fear than by hope. It is often illustrated by the change in the conduct of young people who migrate from country neighborhoods to the unknown city environment. In the city they are 'anonymous,' and so cease to feel the pressure of that neighborhood public opinion and conscience which held them to a given course of conduct. Freed from the fear of public disapproval such as they have known, they are thrown back upon their own instincts unless new associations — a new group life — takes the place of the old and asserts *its* influence over them for good or ill. Here is the explanation of the wrecking of many lives.

The second of these forms is more permanent and of greater power, since it represents control of the individual through the formation of a kind of character; and this character is the result of his social contact with the standards and ideals of his society. It is unfortunate, therefore, that these standards should ever be anything but the best and upon the highest level. The failure of soci-

ety, from time to time, in making its control take this second form is a failure in the efficiency of its institutions, particularly those which have been called 'primary,' in the sense that they form direct and 'face-to-face' contacts among men. If men are controlled only by law and custom, and by the fear of punishment or social disapproval, the removal of this fear leads to a breakdown of control. Wherever changing conditions weaken the efficiency of the law or undermine the fear of public disapproval, control through these agencies of society becomes weak or of no effect. No society can trust to such control alone. In the end it must rely upon those standards and ideals which rest, not on fear of being caught, but on positive ideals embedded in the character itself and which lead spontaneously to social action. The recent apparent increase in crime in the United States may probably be laid, at least in part, to a relative failure in our primary institutions to build moral habits and standards into the character of youth. The family and the Church are the institutions which heretofore have most tended to control conduct through influence upon character. But both of these institutions have lost some of their power and are less vigorous in their development of moral character. The result is a growing tendency of youth to be controlled only by fear of the law or of social disapproval; and if unsocial behavior can be concealed, it thus escapes all apparent blame. Yet communities are continually placing their reliance for conduct in external instruments. They propose to meet the evils brought to light in divorce, in juvenile court cases, in gambling, or in commercialized vice by a change in law. While this is often needed, yet the more fundamental need is a vitalizing of the institutions which directly build moral character, not only by teaching, but by direct coöperation in social efforts which rest upon moral standards. Play clubs and social groups which aid the family to do its work have a real place; but more important is it to free the family from those limitations which weaken it as a moral-education group institution. A better economic basis for family welfare; a deepened consciousness of parental moral obligation to childhood; education of parents and children in moral principles and standards; and, as the work of the Church, a determined and fearless teaching and emphasis upon righteousness as

fundamental to the life of society, would accomplish much more than new laws and penalties concerning divorce or vice or crime itself.

Loyalty. Regard for social approval shows itself in all kinds of men as group loyalty. Every one tends to identify himself with the life of his group. He speaks and thinks of the group as *our* or *my* group; its interests are his interests; its friends are his friends; its enemies are his enemies; its approvals, sentiments, opinions, likes, dislikes, hatreds, are his also. Any group may build such a reaction in its members if it be relatively permanent. Thus men are not loyal to a chance crowd, but to family, friends, clubs, church, nation. Loyalty is the result of a consciousness of unity of the individual with a group; whatever builds that unity tends to build the feeling of loyalty. Thus men who come from remote regions into the common life of a city, in time become conscious of a loyalty to it; and men of most diverse national origins, in the Great War and at other times, have exhibited striking loyalty to the new country of America which they had come to know and feel to be their own. The development of loyalty is the most essential basis of social control; the possibility of its development rests upon establishing those favorable contacts between the members of the social group which make them glad to think of it as their own: economic opportunity, educational advantages, social kindliness, and treatment which is fundamentally just and fair. To share in such a community life is to stimulate hopefulness and to build loyalty quickly and firmly. Loyalty grows best and most readily where group standards are just and fine, calling forth the best nature within its members. And since this is so, the highest loyalty is for the individual an ideal expressing his attachment to an ideal social life with standards which he believes an ideal community should have. This thought adds to ordinary moral standards something of the quality and character of religion in human society, and it may be best at this point to indicate briefly the way in which religion functions in relation to social control.

Religion and morals — Stages of religious evolution. Some form of religion seems to be found among all peoples, even those of the lowest grade. Primitive religion seems to arise from wonder

and fear in regard to the unknown and the mysterious. It always seems to have been a group problem rather than an individual one. The entire group life was involved in the struggle to live and to understand the world in which its life was cast. How to meet the dangers of life, particularly those which come at moments of crisis and special danger, gave rise to rules or principles of behavior which the group believed must be observed. Ceremonies and observances, and ultimately a priestly class to carry out these observances, were further developments based upon the helplessness of man in the face of the unknown. It was natural to assume that the causes of unexplained happenings were to be found in Powers inhabiting the unknown, and it was natural also to hope that this Power or Powers might help the group in time of need. Thus individuals were forbidden to do those things which it was believed would bring upon the group disfavor rather than favor. In this way behavior was controlled through a fear of punishment by the group, and at times also a fear of direct punishment by the Powers of the unknown world.

Religion becomes identified with social standards of morality. This may be thought of as the general character of social control through religion throughout many stages and in many varieties of religious thought and practices. But somewhere in the history of many religions, a gradual change came about in the character of their religious social control. The belief was reached that the Power beyond man is interested, not in ceremonies and sacrifices, but in the moral standards and conduct of society itself. This constituted a revolution in religious thinking. No longer could this Power or God be thought of as external to the real life of society. His prime interest is in character and conduct, and the principles or standards of conduct which society has found to be good must be the ones which God approves. Thus the individual who cared for the approval of his society, and so came to govern his conduct with that in mind, was led to identify the approval of God and the approval of society, and to feel, therefore, more deeply the meaning of those virtues of character which underlie the moral standards. Justice and mercy, truth and honesty, temperance and chastity gain, therefore, a new meaning and an added power in the control of life.

Moral idealism enforced by religion. This development is aided further by the change in the basis of religious thinking from fear to love. Standards based on fear either of men or of the Unknown Power tend to remain external in their disciplinary quality. But love leads to voluntary and willing conformity in conduct, which in time changes character itself. "If we can awaken in ourselves a social and socially religious spirit and ideal, our discipline will come by the endeavor to give this spirit and ideal expression." [1] When this stage of religious thought is reached, the moral standard gains a new meaning, in so far as religion influences men's lives. The standard of conduct becomes an appealing ideal — not only an actual body of rules about conduct found in practice, but an ideal for society and its members to work toward. Thus moral idealism in regard to the ultimately worth-while social life wins strength and power, and conscience is quickened and made sensitive.

It must be observed, however, that this enforcement of social standards by religion is real only in so far as men are influenced by religion. Most men in civilized countries are no longer controlled by the fear of future punishments, and many do not have regard for religious teachings of any sort. One of the most difficult yet searching and serious problems of our age has to do with the possibility of enlarging the vital influence of religious institutions in relation to the moral standards and ideals upon which society rests.

Summary. To summarize what has thus far been presented: Group life is both natural and necessary; if each individual were to try to live by himself, civilization would dissolve and life would end. Moral standards are the approved ways or principles of conduct by which group life is made possible, and are thus essential to group and to individual existence. They are imperfect because group varieties and organization are changing, and also because they often are made by and in the interest of some part or class only of society, and so are not universal or truly moral. Social morality is thus the basis of the art of good citizenship; it involves more and more adequate coöperation and a loyalty to the largest social life. The value of religion, in the social sense, is, in so far as it furnishes additional motive power to the building of community life through

[1] Cooley, C. H.: *Social Process*, p. 147. Charles Scribner's Sons.

loyalty to high ideals of conduct, a loyalty not only to existing society, but to an ideal community life. A society's unity and strength is greatest when its moral standards are held as a religious faith.

But loyalty of a fine sort has greatest power when it is embodied in a leader, a cause, and a living social group. The discipline of men by force is not enough to make social unity, nor is the discipline by custom; in the long run reflective moral standards must bind men together, discipline resulting from self-control and a sense of social obligation.[1] Such moral standards become ideals which sway men's hearts and lead them to struggle for great causes, to make great sacrifices and to build high civilizations. As Hudson writes:

> If nature thwarts man, man overcomes nature and shapes it to his uses, so that it thwarts him less and less. This is the story of civilization and its inner meaning — the shaping of nature to man's ideals; forests into cities, stones into temples, wildernesses into highways, colors into paintings, sounds into music and the articulate dreams of literature. Out of recalcitrant dust, a sword of flame to storm the heights! Science gives us her gift, the laws of nature; but they would be a worthless gift if they were not such that we could use them in the service of Progress toward the Perfect which we restlessly and forever seek.[2]

READING REFERENCES

Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to Study of Sociology*, chs. XXIX, XXX, XXXI.
Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, chs. XXII, XIV, XV, XVI, XXVIII.
Cooley, C. H.: *Social Organization*, ch. XXXII.
Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology*, chs. XVII and XVIII.
Hadley, A. T.: *The Standards of Public Morality.*
Hadley, A. T.: *Freedom and Responsibility*, chs. II, V, VI.
Ross, E. A.: *Social Control.*
Bushee, F. A.: *Principles of Sociology*, ch. XXVIII.
Ellwood, C. A.: *The Reconstruction of Religion.*
Hobhouse, L. T.: *Elements of Social Justice*, p. 185.

[1] Compare the previous discussion in Chapter XII, "How Groups are Held Together."

[2] Jay William Hudson: *The Truths We Live By*, p. 178. D. Appleton & Co.

QUESTIONS

1. If the way men act is not controlled by compulsion, how is it controlled?
2. Compare social control with self-control.
3. Do men who become conscious of their unity with their fellow-men show a larger or smaller sense of social responsibility than criminals?
4. Are criminals ever loyal to any group? Are men loyal to their families? Boys to their 'gang' or to their school? How does loyalty as a basis of conduct differ from compulsion?
5. Is it possible to act from loyalty to a small group and yet be disloyal to larger or more inclusive society?
6. If one acted from loyalty to the fundamental interests and welfare of humanity as a whole, would his conduct be in line with the chief social virtues? Would he then be acting in loyalty to moral principles rather than particular opinions?
7. What are virtues? Name several. Why are they of value to society?
8. Study and explain the following quotation from T. G. Soares: "The true socialization of the individual has taken place when, regarding himself as an end — that is, a being whose good is worthy to be sought — he regards all other persons also as ends, never using any one simply as a means, and finds his own welfare in the welfare of the group to which in any wise he belongs, even the great human group in its entirety." (Quoted by C. A. Ellwood in "What is Socialization?" in the *Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. VIII, no. 1, p. 7.)

CHAPTER XXVIII

EDUCATION: SOCIAL CONTROL AND PROGRESS

Educability of man — Society an educational environment. The study of society gives clear evidence that man is educable. His mind is plastic and easily modified by contact with varying influences. Contrary to an opinion often expressed that human nature is unchangeable, human nature is itself a product of varying conditions of life and varies as the conditions vary. Disregarding individual differences, approximately the same inborn tendencies and capacities constitute the basis for the most divergent civilizations. The men of ancient Greece or Rome, in their original mental possibilities, apparently were not unlike the men of to-day; but the content of their minds — what they thought about and their particular interests and standards, differed very greatly. The beginnings of human nature are found in heredity, but the content of the mind, what tools it shall use, the direction of its interests, the materials of its thought, the standards of its judgments and its approvals, vary with the system of social life, the social environment, which educates men.

All society is thus a great educational medium in which men live, and which is moulding human nature to its will. Just as the physical highways determine the directions which trade shall take, so, even more definitely, the lines of mental relationship as shown in knowledge, interests, and valuations, give direction and govern the development of the thinking and the behavior of mankind. Changes in the lives of men take place through changes in the directive or educational quality and forces of society. Ultimately the directing relationships become fixed and established in those permanent forms called 'institutions,' and it is therefore possible to say that the most fundamental educational factors of society are its institutions. James Bryce has said, "Institutions, when solidified by long practice, come to be, because respected and valued, a permanent factor in moulding and developing character itself." [1]

[1] James Bryce: *The Study of American History*, p. 19. The Macmillan Co.

Yet the character of institutions and their adequacy for good educational results depend upon the nature of the society itself. Every community has its institutions; these may be alive and vigorous, or they may be left-overs from earlier days, ill-adapted to the needs of their age and with little vitality. The educational quality and standards of the community will vary enormously in these two cases. For illustration, the weakness of the community life of rural villages, as found in the continued loss of its vigorous youth and the backward condition of its health or its ability to coöperate, is evidently, in part at least, the result of its stagnant and decaying institutions. The more or less complete absence of distinctly rural economic and recreational institutions, together with the traditional and ill-adapted character of the church, the school, and local government, inevitably results in a social life upon a low plane. To better this social life, old institutions must be reshaped or new ones developed which are adapted to its real needs.

Special educational institutions are necessary. Among social institutions, however, some are more directly or intentionally educational than others. Because youth is the age of growth and so is the age of greatest educational possibility, the institutions most closely associated with youth have unusual importance for education. The family has always had, therefore, special significance as an educational institution. Gradually, however, as societies have expanded and diversified their interests, other institutions have arisen with the special function of education. Central among these is the school, which at the present time is used as the express and specialized agency of society for the education primarily of its youth, but in many of its aspects reaching out also to the education of the entire population regardless of age.

The school and the development of knowledge. The fields of education are many. Ultimately, the aim of society in so far as it undertakes consciously to educate its members, is to bring about a certain kind of behavior. Thus it may endeavor to build into their acquired natures virtues, approvals, and interests, as well as knowledge, since these gradually developed phases of character lead to the kind of conduct which makes for social strength and vigor.[1]

[1] See the excellent discussion of education in Chapter XXXV of Hayes's *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*.

"Education," says William James, "is the organization of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies to behavior." But the particular field of education which constitutes the primary interest of the school is knowledge. To aid growing minds to understand the world and its life in its varied aspects, and therefore to substitute knowledge for ignorance, is its special work. The love of truth is the basal virtue in its field of interest, and this is true in part of all the other special instruments or institutions of education; for the school whose service is primarily to youth is not the only directly educational instrument of our age. The press is equally such an instrument, and so also are libraries, museums, the theater, and every forum for discussion.

Transmitting the social heritage. While growth of knowledge is then the special field of education, it has not always been so recognized. More usual, indeed, has been the view that the school and other educational agencies have as their business the *handing on of tradition*. This is to be clearly distinguished from the development of knowledge and the pursuit of truth. The relation between the two is definite, but one recognizes an established life, a system of beliefs and approvals resting on the accumulated knowledge of the past; the other looks forward; its aim is discovery and its outlook is into the future. The difference is an enormous one; it is the difference between a completed or settled life and a moving or progressive one; and it is inevitably the basis of much of the conflict in the thought, the ambitions, and the ideals of men in all ages.

Yet the relation between these two possible aims in education is not necessarily one of conflict, and it is important to understand their really close interdependence. In a word, this may be stated as the dependence of new knowledge or insight upon that which already exists. All advance in the understanding of life is built upon the foundation of the already discovered. The first stage in education is, therefore, to bring the minds of the young into touch with the social inheritance — the accumulated knowledge which has come down from earlier activities and cumulative discoveries of the past. Undoubtedly this is the basis and the foundation opportunity in all education. Knowledge is cumulative, and this is true not only of natural science — the understanding of nature — but

equally of social science which embodies the growth of knowledge in regard to the relations of men with each other. Like a stairway with many landings, knowledge and the understanding of life present to succeeding generations the chance to enter upon the stairway at different levels; the future growth of the individual is largely conditioned by the height of the landing-place upon the stairway at which he begins his ascent.

But the transmission of the social inheritance to youth is only the first step in education. The discoveries of the past and its accumulated knowledge are but the foundations upon which new structures are to be built. It is an utterly imperfect and defective knowledge. The hope of improvement in the life of society rests upon two pillars — one, the growth of knowledge, and the other, the social utilization of this knowledge, which is itself dependent upon growth in the understanding of the aims of society and its social control. Education must, therefore, always look forward toward new knowledge — toward discovery — and toward continual readjustment and redirection based on this knowledge. The school can never wisely be stationary, either in curriculum, method, or content of subject-matter discussed; and above all things, since this is true, there must be the fullest freedom to the mind to explore, to question, and so to see nature and man in fresh and original ways.

The growth of knowledge. It is of the utmost importance, as a basis of the understanding of social life, that every one should have some mental picture of the marvelous growth of human knowledge and its relation to human progress. Such a picture would include the tools which the mind uses in the building of knowledge — language, number, logic, the laboratory; it would show the savage with his magic charms, helpless in the face of nature, followed by succeeding stages of the conquest and use of nature due to discovery and invention, leading one to another and gradually building that *accurate and ordered body of knowledge which is called science* — a struggle and a conquest still going on and never to be finished, but only added to from age to age. The picture would reveal also the gradual spread of this accumulating knowledge — at first a secret possession of a few and handed on as a sort of private property upon which depended prestige and power; later, shared by a larger leisure

class and giving enriched life to this class, surrounded by the vast mass of the ignorant and consequently depressed body of mankind; and then, through the invention of printing and the cheapening of the products of the press, there is included a wider and wider circle of those who share the knowledge of their age and contribute to its enrichment and its growth. And as an ideal there rises also the thought, the need, the possibility of the spread of real education to every man, to every woman, to every child, in every race and nation, while the idea and existence of a separate leisure class disappears before the larger idea of leisure for all kinds and conditions of men — a leisure both for understanding, for creating, and for enjoying the life of the age in which they chance to live.

Education is the fundamental opportunity. Through its agencies are created those favoring environments by which each individual, from the humblest to the greatest, may find his interests and his stimulation to the achievements which his nature makes possible. The picture would, therefore, reveal, also, the struggle for the right to share in this opportunity — an individual struggle and often a mass or class struggle; and it would reveal the endless struggle for freedom to think and to express thought, in the effort to understand and to add to knowledge both of nature and of man.

The school and its growth. The powerful agency, which educates youth and which spreads its influence beyond youth to adult life, is the school. From its origin until modern times the school has been a private organization and has existed primarily for the advantage of a limited class. Its purpose, therefore, was limited and determined by this fact. It was not to be expected that it would be an instrument of progressive discovery of new knowledge; its purpose rather, as has been said, was to pass on to the members of a leisure class the standards, the point of view, the acquired culture which this class held to be good. Through the school, youth was expected to find its way into the usages and knowledge which were prized by the cultivated life of the leisure world. And in addition, the school became a place of training for the professions which in their origin were attached to the leisure class.

It is a long journey from such a conception of the school to the American public school of to-day. Undoubtedly one of the great-

est steps in human progress has been the making of the schools free, public, and compulsory between certain ages. As long as the school was private in its conduct and expensive as well as voluntary to those who attended it, it reached but a small fraction of the population of any country.

The public school system maintained by government is, in most parts of the world in which it is found, an institution whose history is very recent. In Europe in the upheaval of the French Revolution such an educational system found its strongest advocates. In Prussia a public school had begun somewhat earlier, but was rapidly expanded during the era of the struggle with Napoleon and the succeeding years; while the French school system which was planned by leading democratic thinkers of the French Revolutionary movement was organized in the Napoleonic régime and developed in the quarter of a century that followed. In America the New England colonies were interested in education from their beginning. Schools were required to be established by each town in Massachusetts as early as 1647. The public support of schools was provided for in the famous Ordinance of 1787 which organized the governmental system of the Old Northwest and which became the model for the government of new Territories and States as they were settled in the farther West. Out of such beginnings has grown in America the system of State schools, both elementary and secondary. These schools are free in the sense that they call for no payment of tuition; they are open to all youth alike, without regard to social standing, and attendance upon them (or upon private schools) for a period of years is made compulsory by the laws of nearly every one of the States. These schools are a phase of the movement toward democracy in Europe and America, the rapid development of which in the nineteenth century is the most significant aspect of the history of recent times. It is suggestive that the demand for the establishment of free public schools in the United States in the first third of the nineteenth century was primarily an expression of the purpose and program of labor organizations to provide educational opportunity for their children. They expressly stated their belief that education is the basis of opportunity.

What shall be taught? As schools have been opened to all classes of the population, the question of *what shall be taught* inevitably has had to be reconsidered. The rapid expansion in knowledge during the past century, particularly in the natural sciences, has enlarged and changed our outlook upon the world and has transformed industry. Necessarily this new knowledge must be incorporated into the curriculum of the school, and so the various sciences have become part of the educational program. The fact, too, that the school no longer provides merely for a leisure class has led to a recognition of the importance of adapting the subjects taught to the needs of a working people. Changes in the conditions of living, resulting from the use of machinery following the industrial revolution, also has aided in this reconsideration of what should be taught. The farm and the apprentice system previously had been the chief means of training for industry, but with the coming of machinery and the consequent growth of cities these means of training no longer accomplished their former result. It, therefore, began to be demanded that the school should fit youth for industry and hence that its curriculum should be in part industrial-vocational.

In addition to this aspect, there has grown a feeling that an understanding of society and its problems — the problems of citizenship — must be an important part of the work of the school. The improvement of social life calls for intelligent action on the part of every citizen; if the school is to enable men to live better lives, it must help them to understand the forces which build their society. The struggles between the conflicting economic and social groups in society will destroy it unless there be a clearer general understanding and an intelligent control of these conflicting interests. Therefore the demand has arisen that the social sciences — history, government, economics, and the like — should be given an important place among school subjects.

Moreover, the developments of knowledge in new directions has given variety and interest to life. Such fields as music and art, as well as science, have undergone varied development and afford a cultural enrichment to the lives of those who appreciate them. It is plain that man through education may develop taste and appre-

ciation and so enlarge his life as a whole through education in these and similar fields of knowledge. Thus there has grown the demand to include such subjects also in the curriculum.

Vocational aims and difficulties. It is evident, therefore, that the effort to make the school an agency for fitting youth to the varied needs and possibilities of life has gathered about three aims: the vocational, the social, and the cultural. Each of these presents serious problems and is not yet clearly worked out into a definite and accepted plan; indeed, the whole question of what shall be taught is in process of experiment and trial. The vocational aspect of education presents two conflicting ideas. Children need to be taught how to work and to be trained to steady and disciplined as well as skilled work habits, since they must all enter some kind of work-life. It seems natural, therefore, in a machine age, to propose that they be taught how to handle machinery and be given a direct trade training; and this has become the program of many who are interested in this problem. They point sadly to the waste of child-lives through entrance into unskilled, blind-alley jobs which have no future nor afford any training for other work. To offset this danger, a training which looks toward a definite trade skill is advocated. But, on the other hand, there is the fact that the development of automatic machinery tends to increase the demand for unskilled labor rather than skilled, which makes it true that the work-years of youth in automatic factory production are the best-paid years in the average worker's life, and that steady advance in earning-power through development of skill is a thing of the past for many wage-earners. Consequently, it is held by many that the real need is not for vocational training, but an education which shall fit youth to employ wisely the leisure time which the reduction of working hours is bringing about.

Undoubtedly each of these positions is in part true. Certain is it that there is a vast increase in the monotonous, low-standard, unskilled machine-tending jobs. If this tendency is to continue and to dominate all production, then it is folly and waste to make industrial training an important part of the education of youth. This is the aspect which is seen by Arthur Pound in his description of the "Iron Man."

In a town dominated by automatic machinery [he writes], the educational problem is to train youth for the right use of leisure. Why waste time teaching city children how to work, when their chief need is to know how to live? . . . As machines come to do more of the necessary work of the world, the right use of leisure, as an antidote for sloth and luxuriousness and as a means of mental, moral, and spiritual health, becomes essential to national vigor.[1]

Yet it is also true that there is still, and perhaps always will be, much of difference between employments in regard to the extent of the domination of machinery. In many occupations the specializations which have come from the use of machinery are such as to call for a high degree of skill for many workers. The low-standard and blind-alley job which is a menace to capable and ambitious boys and girls represents the level of attainment suitable to naturally backward minds. It seems, therefore, highly desirable to provide for *all who are capable of profiting by it* an industrial training of as wide and thorough a kind as possible. The effort to do this has taken two main directions, one with reference to city life and its occupations, and the other looking toward agriculture and rural life. Moreover, through the natural interest which young people have in their possible vocations, it is possible to expand the general educational life and to lengthen the period of its influence, if vocational interest be recognized and given encouragement and direction. This is equally true of agriculture and of industry, and results in raising the level of both rural and city productive processes, as well as in enriching individual and community life.

The vocational education of girls presents, however, a special problem. The entrance of women into industries of every character has made it necessary to provide an industrial training which will aid them in the industrial world. Far more than in the case of boys do they drift into unskilled and blind-alley jobs in which the wage is low and the work itself can have little or no upbuilding or developing influence. The fact that girls remain in industrial occupations a much shorter period than boys means that the work which they do tends to be, educationally, of a less worth-while kind. But this fact is the outgrowth of the other fact that a large percentage of

[1] *The Iron Man in Industry*, pp. 207, 230. The Atlantic Monthly Press.

women care for homes, this being their vocation for a considerable part of their lives. A training which shall prepare them for this vital vocation is of profound social as well as individual importance and has led to the widespread teaching of home economics. Important as this study is, it should not, however, prevent the careful and thorough industrial training of girls, since more and more they are finding it necessary to occupy industrial positions and are continuing in these positions for longer and longer periods of their lives.[1]

Education and social relations. It is always necessary to go beyond vocation, since vocation is a means to an end. Because man lives with his fellows and all life is associated living, it becomes a vital need that men should learn how to live with one another wisely and happily. Therefore, the fields of social life should form a central part of the work of the school. The complete interdependence of the individual and society makes it inevitable that all real education must be social in its roots and aims. Education, therefore, and the school as its instrument, tends more and more to deal with social relations. If it does not do so, it is likely not to serve the real interests of society nor to be a factor in the making of progress. "Only social education can turn exploitation into service, and capitalize achievement for the general weal instead of for personal aggrandizement." [2] To create social interests in the individual, to develop social intelligence, and as a consequence to stimulate and direct the sense of mutual interdependence and sympathy, which are the bases of real coöperation, constitute the heart of all real education. "The object of an education is to give children the knowledge they need to develop in them the power to handle themselves in our own world." [3] "A firm grip of the social world means a comprehension of, and a sympathy with, current industry, current science, and current politics." [4]

The recognition of this point of view is recent, but is already profoundly changing the character of the education of our day, not so much in the actual accomplishment of results as in the varied trials and experiments which are being undertaken to introduce into the

[1] The discussion of this problem by Willystine Goodsell, in *The Education of Women*, Chapter VI, is thorough and suggestive.

[2] A. J. Todd: *Theories of Social Progress*, p. 518. The Macmillan Co.

[3] General Education Board. [4] *Ibid.*

curriculum subjects called 'social.' Without doubt the marvelous advances of modern times in scientific discovery can become the instrument of destruction as well as of human service. Says Nicholas Murray Butler, in an address before the Ohio State Bar Association:

> One of the most distinguished of American scientists recently said, in my hearing, that he had about come to the conclusion that all his discoveries and advances were harmful rather than helpful to mankind because of the base and destructive uses to which they were likely to be put. He insisted that, in the present state of public intelligence, if there was a lofty use and a lower use of his discoveries and inventions, evidence multiplied that the lower use would be the first chosen. He pointed, among other things, to the fact that the Great War, with all its destructiveness and appalling loss of life and treasure could never have been fought except by the use of two of the most beneficent and striking of modern inventions, namely, the telephone and typhoid prophylaxis. What, he added, is the use of inventing and improving the telephone or of discovering and applying typhoid prophylaxis, if the killing of millions of men is the best use that can be made of them?

Unless there is also an education which looks toward the moralizing of life, 'progress' is a term of little meaning. The education of the school has tended and still tends to be centered in the individual. Yet the progress of society depends upon coöperation between men. How little there is in the school curriculum, from the first grade to the last year of the university, which definitely suggests coöperation and educates youth in this direction! It is this which constitutes the greatest mental value in what are called 'student activities,' since of necessity these demand team-work, and the successful student leader as well as his team-mates learn how to work together. It is unfortunate that this prime basis of the really educated life should have no consciously recognized place in the school's curriculum or method.

Control of the school. Whether the curriculum shall look toward vocation, toward social intelligence, and also toward the cultural enrichment of individual life, depends not only upon its content, but also upon its control. For the essence of the really cultivated mind is its freedom from prejudice, from narrowness, from selfishness, from the limitations which arise from every type of ignorance.

"The function of education," says Dewey, "is to free the experience from routine and caprice." A 'liberal education' is spoken of in relation to the experience made possible by the college or university; but it is equally applicable to every grade of school. A liberal education is one that liberates the mind — that is, sets it free from the social prejudice, the general ignorance which prevents progress. But every school system is subject to the danger that it will be controlled in the interest of some special social group. Where this is found, it tends to become a stationary and non-progressive education. In the end, it cannot meet the growing needs of youth as a whole, its look is backward, and it becomes the instrument of class prejudice. It is this which Todd has in mind when he says, "Whether education is static or dynamic depends on the content and method, on whether it is universal or the privilege of a certain class, or by whom it is administered; that is, *the question of control.*" The question of whether education is universal is closely related to the question of control, and both are related to the question of content or curriculum. Indeed, the whole direction of education is, in the end, an aspect of control. Whenever the school reaches only a class, it tends to serve only the narrow and prejudiced interest and point of view of that class, and also to increase the separation between those who are called intelligent and the ignorant. What the class is determines the character of control; if a military class dominates, the school becomes, as in the case of the German military autocracy, a militarized school; if it is a class of some other character — an ecclesiastical control, for example — the school reflects this type of class thought and will. It is this thought that leads Galsworthy (rightly or wrongly) to call the English public schools caste-factories; the same thought is in Cooley's statement: "Our principal institution having opportunity for its object is education, and accordingly this has an increasing function arising from the increasing requirements that life makes upon it. Where it does not perform this function adequately, we see the result in social failure and degeneration, crimes of stunted children, privilege thriving upon the lack of freedom, the poor tending to become a misery caste, the prevalence of apathy and inefficiency." [1] And again the

[1] *Social Process*, p. 61. Charles Scribner's Sons.

same thought is found in the remark of Jane Addams, in speaking of true education as "a culture which will not set its possessor aside in a class with others like himself, but which will, on the contrary, connect him with all sorts of people by his ability to understand them as well as by his power to supplement their present surroundings with the historic background." And she says, further, that "those best results of civilization upon which depend the finer and freer aspects of living must be incorporated into our common life and have free mobility through all elements of society if we would have our democracy endure." [1]

Is educational opportunity really universal and adequate? It is, therefore, important to ask how widespread or universal is the influence of our school education. While the school touches the life of a far higher per cent of the total population in America and in Western Europe than was the case fifty or more years ago, it still remains true that far too many are entirely outside its reach, and that there is a very great inequality in the real opportunity which different schools afford. Not much over three quarters of the children of school age in this country are enrolled in school, taking the United States as a whole. Almost five million of the population over ten years of age were found to be illiterate by the Census of 1920, which was six per cent of the total population, and the army examinations seemed to indicate the extraordinary fact that real illiteracy characterized one quarter of the men. Within the population as a whole, illiteracy varied in 1920 from 2.5 per cent of the native white over ten years to 13 per cent of the foreign-born white and 22 per cent of the negro population of the same age period. The urban population showed 4.4 per cent illiteracy, while the rural population registered 7.7 per cent. Out of a school population between the ages of five and eighteen years of 27,750,000, the average daily attendance reached only 16,250,000, and the school enrollment lacked 6,500,000 of equaling the school population. That school opportunities are very unequal is indicated further by such facts as the following. The length of the school year as numbered in days ranged from 123 in Alabama and Kentucky to 179 in Massachusetts, 188 in New York, and 194 in Rhode Island. The expenditure of money for school

[1] *Twenty Years at Hull House*, pp. 435, 452. Copyright, by The Macmillan Co. Reprinted by permission.

purposes shows such variations as almost $49,000,000 for 174 days for an enrollment of 696,000 in California, while Georgia spent $9,000,000 for an enrollment of 691,000, the length of the school year being 145 days. In California the daily attendance was almost the same as the enrollment, while in Georgia the attendance was only slightly over one half the enrollment. In 1916 the school expense per child was $9.30 in Mississippi and $86.36 in Montana.

In addition, it is necessary only to point out that a large per cent of those who enter the first grade drop out by the end of the fifth grade; that invariably the school which the rural child attends is open for from one to four months' less time each year than the school for the city child and is taught by more poorly educated teachers; that the school year varies by localities from four months to ten months; that for over eighty per cent of the school population eight grades represent the maximum of schooling; that those who benefit by high-school education vary from 27 per 1000 of the population in one State to 5.3 per 1000 in another; that equipment varies from nothing but the rudest benches in a poorly lighted one-room building to large, finely constructed city buildings with a well-stocked library and excellent laboratories. If "education is our principal institution having *opportunity* for its object," beyond a doubt opportunity varies enormously, as far as the school is concerned. There is still much to be done to make education universal. Why it is not so is in part due to the apathy of the community, in part to its poverty. The school is, indeed, as J. K. Hart calls it, "a mirror of society," reflecting its weakness as well as its strength.

Special schools and educational movements. In addition to the public school of grammar and secondary grades and such private schools as parallel its activities, there are the 'institutions of higher learning,' which are in part continuations of the public school system supported by the State or the United States and in part are maintained by private endowments. And also there are technical schools of different grades, including trade schools of great variety and for many different trades, schools of higher grade for the training of lawyers, doctors, clergymen, engineers, nurses, journalists, architects, and other similar occupations and professions. Such schools are often a specialized part of the work of private or State

universities or "colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts." The latter, popularly called "Agricultural Colleges," represent a movement toward the widening of vocational educational opportunity coupled with general education, through the aid of the Federal Government. Beginning in 1862 by the passage of the Morrill Act, and added to by later acts of Congress, appropriations have been made to each State for education primarily in "agriculture and the mechanic arts," but including such other subjects as may seem wise, whether vocational or otherwise. In many of the States these funds are now used to support the "colleges of agriculture and engineering" as a part of the State university, while in other States separate institutions have been organized for the same purposes and with the same standards. Since 1917, Federal Government aid is also being given to each State for vocational training in high schools, the types of training pertaining to agricultural, industry, or domestic economy.

The cost of education is a serious bar to the possibility of a wide participation in its benefits. Even though there be no tuition, lack of family income is the most serious of barriers to continued education. The family need of the earnings of children is a prolific cause of their dropping out of school long before the elementary grades are finished; another large group can hope only to finish the grammar school; and but a small per cent of families find it possible to send their children to high school; while those who go through college or university are perhaps no more than two per cent of all who are of suitable age. Out of this condition has grown the movement to bring education to those who are regularly at work in wage-earning occupations; young people and adults may thus, it is hoped, continue education long after the usual routine of the school has been given up. Examples of such attempts are night schools, carried on by private organizations as commercial enterprises or by philanthropic institutions such as the Y.M.C.A. or Y.W.C.A., or by University Extension classes; Correspondence Courses which aim to direct the study of such as can find spare time for this purpose; and quite recently the most interesting experiment of Workers' Colleges maintained by labor unions or labor in general, and aiming to bring higher education to such wage-earners as have the ambi-

tion and vigor to use their leisure for such a purpose. How much can be hoped from these undertakings it is hard to say; they are relatively recent and as yet experimental; but as a determined effort to spread the agencies of education more widely and to enable the masses of the working-class to share its benefits and advantages, they deserve every encouragement.

The press and other educational means. While the school is modern society's most conscious educational institution, there are other agencies which have very great influence in education. Some of these have a direct educational aim, while others are primarily commercial enterprises, but with important educational results. As a rule they affect the education of both adults and young persons. They are usually thought of, however, as part of adult education. Of such agencies by far the most important is the press, including newspapers, magazines, and books. Others of value are public libraries, art galleries and museums, public lectures, the pulpit and other forms of discussion, and the drama. None of these means are, on the whole, so well organized for educational purposes as the school, yet they vastly multiply the contacts between men's minds and afford stimulation in ideas that enormously enlarges the educational possibilities of our age. That they are not better organized for direct educational purposes is due to two facts: to a greater or less degree they are commercial undertakings, education being incidental, so that the character of news, the type of ideas, the quality of mental stimulation, is limited or determined by the possibilities of profit; and, secondly, since they are largely private enterprises they are more likely to be controlled by a special group and teach the ideas which this group wishes to spread — that is, they are used for propaganda rather than real education through development of the power to think, to judge, and to act upon judgment.

These limitations do not apply to such institutions as the public library, which may well be thought of as an extension of the school because of its great educational usefulness. Nor do they apply in both respects to all the others, such as the pulpit and public lectures. But the press stands out because of its extraordinary educational possibilities and at the same time because of the evident limitations to its usefulness. Because of the great educability of man

— in the sense that it is possible to direct his thought and beliefs, his prime interests, his sentiments and approvals, and so his conduct and behavior — it is of the highest importance that the instruments of his education should be devoted to the development of real intelligence, and not to the propaganda of some special group or class. There is at present perhaps no question of greater immediate significance for social life than that of keeping clear and pure the channels which run from mind to mind. The control which is sometimes exercised by advertisers over the expression of news is a serious danger here, and equally so is the ownership of newspapers by those who wish to push political or economic ambitions. Fortunately, to some extent, one propagandist program tends to contradict another, so that the reading public gains an education through their contradiction. But the development within the profession of journalism of a more binding ethical code, based on the obligation to serve the public welfare, would mean a great advance in the real education of the people. *Real education rests, first, upon the development of the power to understand, to think, to judge; and secondly, upon the use of this power under standards which lead to the ultimate service of man.* Propaganda cares for none of this; its interest is in making the view and interest of a subordinate element in society prevail in the control of the entire machinery and life of society; it therefore persuades men by false appeal and by suggestion which defeats thought. The greatest menace to progressive democratic society is the insidious *attack of propagandisms upon the instruments of education.*

Education and progress. In what has been said of the directions which education may take, the difference has been indicated between education as the transmission of established knowledge and belief, and education as the basis and instrument of progress. These two ideals of education are in constant conflict, though clear thinking should prevent this. The basis of all progress is freedom, and to the institutions of education, such as the school and the press, freedom is peculiarly necessary, since they are the final instruments of adjustment among men to the continually changing foundations of life. Whatever makes for a more intelligent and juster system of social life may be thought of as in the nature of

progress. On the basis of society as it is — its knowledge and agreements — these progressive changes must be made. Therefore, the beginning of education is the transmission of the understanding of life as it is, together with its ideals and standards. But education cannot stop there without blocking all progress, and in the end its highest work is to aid in building a better social life. It must be experimental, never fixed, always unsettled and unsettling, because the search for truth is always disturbing.

Community surveys. Certain aims which society may adopt as a means to progress through education may be suggested as illustrations. Each community is in part the determiner of its own progress through its organization for this purpose. Its institutions and the community life itself are as good as its knowledge and purposes, and no better. Probably the basis upon which conscious community organization should be built is a survey of its actual life. Community surveys are to-day being used by the better communities and the art of making such surveys is a rapidly developing one. To make public the exact condition of the life of its people — its wealth and poverty, its health situation, the condition of its housing, its recreation arrangements, its crime, its education, its religious life, its system of transportation and control of public utilities, the make-up of its population, and other aspects of its life, is like a business man's taking an inventory in order to know what to do with his business. To 'know one's own community' is the beginning of citizenship, and this is possible only if the community itself makes a careful survey of its life.

Research bureaus. Community progress may also be greatly fostered by an appropriate bureau of research. Surveys give a general description of life as it is found. A bureau of research, as the name suggests, is interested in the study of possible lines of improvement, through comparison and investigation both of other communities and of new possibilities. Such a bureau is the community's body of scientific experts whose work should be the basis on which to build for the future. Most communities tend to modify their system of living by haphazard ways which are usually guesses. In the natural sciences man has learned how slow is the growth of knowledge by this method; he has finally developed a

scientific method of research and experiment which, as a result, has enabled him to make enormous strides in the knowledge of nature. Something like this needs to be done in the building of the life of the community. Research and comparison with other communities, where experiment is impossible, furnish a solid basis upon which to build; and it is wise to remember that community life does not need to be an unconscious chance growth, but may be the result of conscious and intelligent planning.

Coöperation and education. Community life is simply coöperation for the purposes of wise and wholesome living. To bring about such coöperation is really the most important work the community has to do; its life and happiness depend upon it. The more definitely coöperation is recognized and then studied and improved, the more does a community consciousness become definite and clear, and community consciousness is the basis upon which grows community conscience. The line of growth seems to be by these steps: coöperation, community consciousness, community conscience, individual loyalty to community welfare. In the last analysis, while knowledge of itself is the basis of real community life, only through using that knowledge coöperatively will fine citizenship result; but civic loyalty is itself the basis of further progress. The building of community life is ultimately a moral problem. "The life that men live together is a joint product to which the will, the passion, the intellect, the temperament of everyone concerned makes its contribution. . . . Equal freedom in a common life is the simple meaning of democracy." [1]

In the larger world, of which communities are the component parts, the problem is more complicated, but the same principles of action are necessary to its progress. Research, discussion, coöperation, in the end lead to more intelligent life and to a wider loyalty not only to separate communities but to the finer social life which forms the ideal which underlies the thought of progress.

READING REFERENCES

Dewey, J.: *Democracy and Education*, pp. 1–130.
Dewey, J.: *Human Nature and Conduct*, pp. 278–332.

[1] Hobhouse, L. T.: *Elements of Social Justice*, p. 185. G. Allen & Unwin.

Bagley, W. C.: *Educational Values*, chs. 1–6.
Bode, B. H.: *The Fundamentals of Education*, pp. 1–83.
Hayes, E. C.: *Introduction to Study of Sociology*, chs. XXV and XXVI.
Dealey, J. Q.: *Sociology*, ch. XIX.
Blackmar, F. W., and Gillin, J. L.: *Outlines of Sociology*, ch. XXIX.
Ross, E. A.: *Outlines of Sociology*, ch. LII.
King, Irving: *Social Aspects of Education*, chs. 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12.
Ellwood, C. A.: *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, ch. XVI.
Tannenbaum, F.: *The Labor Movement*, chs. XX and XXI.
McClenahan, B. A.: *Organizing the Community*, chs. II and III.
Meikeljohn, A.: *The Liberal College.*
Williams, J. M.: *Principles of Social Psychology*, book VII.
Goodsell, W.: *The Education of Women*, chs. V, VI, VII, IX.

QUESTIONS

1. Contrast the two following quotations and explain the social situation suggested: The minister of Education for Great Britain is reported to have said during the War: "Nine out of ten children (of England) receive no educational training after the age of 14. Ninety per cent of the future citizens of England become wage-earners before their minds are enlightened and their characters formed."

   Miss Jane Addams says that "life in the 'Social Settlement' discloses above all what has been called 'the extraordinary pliability of human nature'; and it seems impossible," she adds, "to set any bounds to the moral capabilities which might unfold under ideal civic and educational conditions."
2. Is a democratic education possible in a country or age which is not democratic?
3. Compare with relation to social progress the social program of 'Elimination of waste' with the program of 'Social education.'
4. Consider each of the following as means of progress through education, and find illustrations of their possible application:
   New and favorable social contacts.
   New discovery.
   New or enlarged sympathies.
   New coöperations.
   A deepened sense of social obligation.
5. In the light of the preceding question explain the meaning of 'socialized education.'
6. Find illustrations in history showing that interference with freedom of thought has brought harm to a society or prevented its progress.
7. What do you think of the following statement from John Ruskin? — "It is not gold or precious stones that make the wealth of a nation; it is the number of healthy, pure and eager sons and daughters that she owns and has brought up in the respect of the public good."
8. What can you tell about the development of "Workers' Colleges?"
9. Tabulate the money cost of a college education. To what extent are these items subject to modification through a change in student standards of expenditure?

CHAPTER XXIX

PROGRESS AND THE ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL EVILS

LOOKING back over the many problems of society which have been under discussion, certain social evils stand out as peculiarly hostile to all possibility of progress. These are not separate and distinct, one from another, but are more or less closely interrelated. It is worth while to recognize definitely these evils; only by so doing will it be possible to unite in the effort for their elimination. War, poverty, ignorance, and disease are probably the greatest evils of society. Poverty, ignorance, and disease belong together as interdependent aspects of human misery, and war appears as a terrible breeder of all three, as well as the creator of hatred and the destroyer of trust and coöperation. At the present moment the most immediate world task is the abolition of war, a task in no way impossible, but to be accomplished through moral vision, education, and definite world organization. The attack upon the other three evils must proceed together; every advance against one is a blow struck at the others. Each is a cause of the others, and the battle against them is a common one. Nor is the prospect a hopeless one. These evils are not inevitable results of human nature; they are products of the imperfect social life which man himself has made. The effort to build society in a better fashion, however slowly, is equally the expression of man's real nature and the lesson of his history.

The possibility of social progress through elimination of waste is thus suggested by the consideration of these evident social evils. Waste in material resources ultimately leads to a demand for their 'conservation'; waste in the mechanism of production drives to new invention, or, if it is in the organization of industry, there is developed a consciousness of its folly and it is accurately measured by engineers through investigation into the 'waste of industry.' [1] But waste is not limited to raw resources, nor to economic produc-

[1] See volume, *Waste in Industry*, by Federated American Engineers.

tion. It passes over into life itself and is expressed in the nature of social organization, these two aspects — individual and social — being but phases of one problem. "How can society consciously order the lives of its members so as to maintain the largest number of noble and happy human beings?" asks Ruskin; and the answer to this question is his measure and test of progress. This is its individual measure; but society as such must consider social measures directly, the indirect consequences of which show themselves in the lives of individuals. It cannot, therefore, hope for permanent betterment by direct appeals to individual action; it must act through directing and controlling the social changes which are continually occurring. The *increasing conscious social control of change* is the fundamental problem of education — what direction shall it take; how fast shall it go and how far; what means of knowledge, of modified social arrangements, of discipline, and what standards shall be used. For the organized life of society, continuing from generation to generation and from one division of society to another, is *the builder of the formed and active character* — the acquired human nature — of mankind.

To what extent society can substitute planned changes in its social organization for those which are unconscious and unobserved, it is impossible to say; yet evidently this is an increasing fact and possibility. Elimination as a social aim and as a measure of social progress has the great advantage that it can be observed and applied consciously, and each advance discloses other wastes which can be avoided. To some extent this has been evident in the past. D. G. Ritchie's statement, "The history of progress is the record of a gradual diminution of waste," is a statement of history as well as an explanation of principle. Perhaps there is no better way to describe the idea of progress than as an increase in the fullness of life; society determines and conditions this increase for individuals by its own wise, adequate, and humane system of life, or prevents it by its harmful and wasteful arrangements. Poverty of life is thus opposed to richness, not only in or mainly in material things, but in life itself and its finer satisfactions. Social evils are those conditions and aspects of the organization of society itself which build poor life rather than full or abundant life. Waste is, therefore, not

only nor chiefly in material things, but in whatever makes for ultimate poverty and weakness. Ignorance, sickness, war, lack of income, are wastes not only because they are material destroyers, but because they prevent the fullness of life which is expressed in terms of fine and varied interests; "beautiful and healthful surroundings, educative and healthful occupations," in the end tend to produce "noble and happy human beings."

And the adoption of a conscious policy looking toward the improvement of the social order involves a belief in its possibility. This belief itself is a factor in bringing progress to pass, as the belief in fate is the basis of a stagnant and wasteful world.

INDEX

Accessibility, essential to populous regions, 12.
Acquired human nature, 56–60.
Acquisitive tendencies, importance of, 30, 31, 37.
Acquisitive struggle, methods used in, 124–26.
Addams, Jane, true education, 347.
Age, varying distributions of, in populations, 19, 20.
Agricultural colleges, 349.
Agricultural training, in schools, 343.
Agriculture, effect of discovery of, 229, 230; opportunity for labor in, reduced by machinery, 254; economic problems of, 255–58; science and capital used in, 255, 257.
Alcohol, degenerative effects of, 63–65; as source of crime, 64, 65, 318, 320, 321.
Alexander the Great, era of social change seen in spread of Empire of, 111.
American people, blood of, 50.
Anger and pugnacity, as inborn tendencies, 36; redirection of instinct of, 36.
Animals, domestication of, 228, 229.
Apartments, city, 265.
Arbitration, substitution of, for strikes, 154, 155.
Army intelligence tests, rating of immigrants by, 239.
Aronovici, C., health and housing, 267.
Art, subjects of, to be included in school curriculum, 341, 342.
Aschaffenburg, G., alcohol as cause of crime, 65.
Assimilation, problem of, 246, 247; retarded by immigrant colonies, 247, 248; levels of, 248, 249; agencies of, 248.
Association, common factor in human, 2; sociology a study of human, 2.
Associative tendencies, nature and importance of, 31, 32.

Bagley, on effect of fear, 36.
Biological evolution, compared to social evolution, 4.
Biological life-cycle, social culture compared to, 71, 73.
Birth rate, in relation to death rate, 20, 21; some of the factors determining, 22; and death rate, importance of, in determining population quality, 190, 191; effect of war on, 192; decline of, in Western World, 192–95; determined largely by standard of living, 194; of native born, reduced by immigration, 241.
Black race, two divergent estimates of, 130. *See also* Negro.
'Blind-alley' jobs, for children, 218.
Boas, F., intermingling of European races, 53.
Booth, C., poverty in England, 290.
Building regulations, 266.
Bushee, F. A., birth rate among feeble-minded parents, 42.
Butler, N. M., science as instrument of destruction, 345.

Cabot, R. C., alcohol and athletics, 64.
California Commission of Housing and Immigration, protection of immigrants, 247.
Capital, and labor as classes, 151; demanded for modern farming, 257; use of corporation for organization of, 286; and labor, conflict between, 286–88; and labor, relation of conflict between to poverty, 297.
Capitalism, description of, 227.
Carver, T. N., methods of acquisition of wealth, 124, 146.
Chadsey, Mildred, health and housing, 267.
Change, social control of, 357. *See also* Social change.
Character, moral standards as a means to forming, 328; formation of, by 'primary' institutions, 329.
Charity, types of, 295; inadequacy of, to remedy poverty, 295.
Cheap labor, introduced by immigration, 240.
Chenery, W. L., relation of industry to life of women, 201.
Child delinquency, three conditions underlying, 211; caused by thwarted life, 211, 212; caused by empty life,

212; caused by undisciplined life, 212; among juvenile workers, 218.
Child labor, description of, 214, 215; demand for, created by modern industry, 215, 216; laws regulating, 216, 217; two causes of, 217, 218; nature of work involved in, 218, 219; not of educational value, 218, 219; "minimum standards" formulated by Children's Bureau, 220.
Child welfare, dependent on other institutions than family, 203; fact illustrating problems of, 203–05; child health basis of, 205, 206; dependent children a problem of, 206–08; delinquency as a problem of, 208–14; standards of, set by school, 220.
Children's Bureau, "minimum standards for children entering employment," 220.
Chinese, on the Pacific Coast, 136, 137; history of, in the United States, 137, 138.
Christianity, Hebrew tradition transferred to, 103.
Citizenship, need for intelligent, 156; as part of school curriculum, 341.
City, growth of, 252, 253, 254, 261, 262; problems of, 261–81; characteristics, 262, 263; planning, neglect of, 263, 264; need for community responsibility in, 263, 264; housing, 264–67; health, problem of, 267–75; playground movement, 279; recreation, 275–80; recreation, problem of provision for, 275, 278–80.
Civilizations, regions of early, 12.
Classes, conflict between, 143–56; basis of division of, 143, 144; individual ability limited by, 144; labor and capital as, 151; conflict of, relation to government and public opinion, 155, 156; change in relationship of, due to industrial revolution, 233; recognition of, by government, 302.
Climate, effect of, on societies, 11.
Committee of Fifty, report of, 64.
Communication, basis of society, 77; forms of, 78–80; improvement of, through printing, 78; democratic government dependent on modern means of, 79; transportation a means of, 79, 80; the channels of suggestion-imitation and sympathy, 84; between primary and secondary groups, 91.
Community, nature of, 5, 6; examples of, 6; historical aspect of, 7; the unit in social life, 35; as name for varieties of group life, 88; opposed to crowd, 88, 89; organization of coöperative agencies in, 173; responsibility of, for delinquency, 211, 213; coöperation of, for betterment of rural life, 261; responsible for betterment of city life, 264; surveys of, 352.
Competition, vocational selection through, 122; natural and economic, 163, 164; economic value of, as method of conflict, 164; economic waste through, 165; and monopoly, aim of society in regulation of, 166; possible modification of evils of, 166.
Compromise, essential to orderly change, 117.
Compulsion, physical, means of social unity, 94–96.
Conduct, low level of, in crowds, 90; social control through standards of, 324; development of conscience through principles of, 325.
Conflict, and coöperation, description of, 120; differences in inborn qualities basis of, 121; social values of, 121, 122; vocational selection through, 122; social evils of, 122, 123; need of methods for limiting destructiveness of, 123; original differences intensified by, 123; domination and exploitation as elements of, 123, 124; three important varieties of, 127; race, 127–40; why race differences lead to, 127–30; between nations, 140–43; between classes, 143–56; wealth basis of, 146; problem of property as basis of, 151; three main methods of, 159; through war, 159–163; economic competition as method of, 163–66; discussion as method of, 166–68; and coöperation, balance between, 170; and coöperation, aims of, contrasted, 171, 172; and coöperation, leadership for, contrasted, 173; between capital and labor, 286–88.
Conservative, customs approved by, 101.
Cooley, C. H., primary and secondary groups, 91; definition of institution, 179.
Coöperation, and conflict, description of, 120; and conflict, balance between, 170; origin of, 170, 171; types and aims of, 171–73; technical and conscious, 171; and conflict, aims of, contrasted, 171, 172; problem of leadership in, 172, and conflict, leadership for, contrasted, 173; methods and units of, 173, 174;

agencies of, 173; a continuous process, 174, 175; need for inclusiveness of, 174; need for teaching of, in schools, 345; and education, 353, 354.
Corporation, used to organize capital, 286.
Correspondence courses, 350.
Crime, relation of alcohol to, 64, 65, 318, 320, 321; among immigrants, 242, 243; relation of, to sickness, 271; and social control, 315; importance of prevention of, 316; social conditions as cause of, 317–19; extent of, in U.S., 317, 318; poverty source of, 318; relation of recreation to, 318, 319; press as influence toward, 319; heredity and, 319, 320; feeble-mindedness as a cause of, 319, 320; degenerative habits as causes of, 320, 321; means of prevention of, 321, 322; increased by punishment, 321.
Criminals, classification of, according to types, 321.
Crowds, characteristics of, 88–91; suggestion in, 89; social dangers of, 90, 91; low order of leadership developed in, 90; lack of responsibility in, 90; low conduct level of, 90; measures to be taken against, 90, 91.
Crusades, illustration of culture-contact, 111.
Culture, habit as, 70–73; guiding influence of society, 70, 71; relation of, to invention, 71; compared to biological life-cycle, 71–73; social differences lessened by contact of, 99; contact of, brought about by migration and war, 107.
Curiosity, as inborn tendency, 37.
Curriculum, of the school, 341, 342; vocational, social, and cultural aims of, 342–44; introduction of social subjects in, 344, 345.
Custom, an evidence of suggestion-imitation, 84, 85; as basis of social unity, 96–98; influence of, on communal life, 97; human need as origin of, 99; invention and discovery as origin of, 100; influenced by natural environment and history, 100; social increase of power of, 101; unifying force in social life, 101, 118, 119; mores or standards, peculiar types of, 101, 102; laws and morals as part of, 102; transfer of, from one people to another, 102–04; contact of, brought about by migration and war, 107; adapted only to ruling group, 114; failure of, in meeting social change, 114; all-inclusiveness of 119.

Dance-hall, as form of commercialized recreation, 276, 277.
Death rate, in relation to birth rate, 20, 21; some of the factors determining, 22.
Degeneracy, alcohol and, 63–65.
Democracy, trend toward, 155, 156, 311; equal recognition of classes essential to, 302; social standards essential to success of, 312, 313.
Democratic government, rights essential to, 307, 308; distinguished from democratic society, 311; failure of, through group partiality, 313; aids development of democratic society, 313, 314.
Delinquency, heredity a cause of, 209; unfavorable social environment a cause of, 209; social factors in, 210–13; home a background of, 210; work and play factors in, 210; relation of poverty to, 210, 211; community interest and oversight a factor in, 211; responsibility of family and community for prevention of, 213; dealt with by juvenile court, 213, 214; and sickness, 271.
Delinquent children, 208–14. *See also* Delinquency.
Dependent children, 206–08.
Desertion, and divorce, 195, 196, 197.
Destructiveness, through conflict, 122, 123.
Devine, E. T., poverty and crime, 272.
Differences, individual and group, 39.
Diffusion, a factor in invention, 71; historical evidences of, 80, 81; isolation being conquered by, 81.
Discussion, as method of conflict, 166–68; organized use of, 167, 168; success of, dependent on education, 168.
Disease, childless marriages caused by, 193; rural, 259.
Division of labor, 226, 227.
Divorce, and desertion, 195, 196; moral aspects of, 196, 197; three main factors underlying, 197.
Domestication, of animals, 228, 229; of plants, 229, 230.
Domination, as an element of social conflict, 123, 124.
Drug habit, 67.
Drunkenness, among Northern and

Southern peoples, 62; Massachusetts Commission on, relation of alcohol to crime, 65. *See also* Alcohol.
Dumont, A., population and the plane of social life, 23.

Economic change, and social organization, interrelation of, 15–17; development of government related to, 301, 302.
Economic competition, conflict through, 163–66; definition of, 164.
Economic institutions, five limitations upon, 224.
Economic loss, in Great War, 161.
Economic order, function and problems of, 223, 224; evolution in, 224–30; stages in development of, 227, 228.
Economic organization, in relation to conflict between nations, 142.
Edman, I., graded difference in mental capacity, 40.
Education, of the negro, 135, 136; in relation to health, 191, 192; in sex problems, need for, 198; rural, 258, 259; means of securing democratic government, 303; man susceptible to, 335; afforded by social environment, 335; two possible aims in, 337; transmitting of social heritage, first stage in, 337, 338; and social relations, 344, 345; is it universal and adequate? 347, 348; new movements in, 349, 350; agencies of, other than schools, 350, 351; press as means of, 350, 351; and progress, 352; coöperation and, 353, 354.
Emotion, relation to inborn tendencies, 30; spread by suggestion in crowds, 89, 90.
Environment, influence of physical on man, 11–13.
Equality, problem of, 313, 314.
Eugenic marriages, education and, 45, 46.
Eugenics, two aims of, 40, 41.
European sub-races, 48, 49.
Evolution, fundamental facts of, 4, 5.
Exploitation, as element of social conflict, 123, 124.

Factory system, development of, 231.
Family, function of, 183; historical backgrounds of, 183, 184, 228, 229; patriarchal form of, 184; changes in life of, 184; functions of, taken over by other institutions, 185; relation of changed economic conditions to, 186–89; common economic life of early, 186, 187; weakening of, through new social contacts, 189; size of, effected by freedom of women, 195; effect of women in industry on, 201; welfare of, dependent on community life, 203; prevention of delinquency by, 213; home problem of, in cities, 264, 265.
Family life, social values of normal, 185, 186; need for regulation and improvement of, 186; labor mobility a factor in, 187, 188; effect of bad housing on, 188; removal of women and children from, through employment, 188, 189.
Farm communities, value of coöperation between, 257.
Farm-labor, an economic problem of agriculture, 256.
Farm ownership, 256, 257, 258.
Fashion, an evidence of suggestion-imitation, 84; not important cause of social change, 109.
Fear, and flight, as inborn tendencies, 35; necessity for training, 35; displacement of, by hope, 35, 36.
Feeble-mindedness, three main groups of, 41; causes of, 41; prevalence of, 41; relation of, to social problems, 42; measures of elimination of, 43; philanthropy in relation to, 44; among delinquents, 209; a cause of crime, 319, 320.
Fertility, essential to populous regions, 12.
Fetter, F. A., low wages created by immigration, 241.
Feudal life, class division in, 143.
Fiske, John, "meaning of infancy," 28.
Folkways, influence of, on communal life, 97, 98.
Food, and sex instincts, 30, 31.
Force, means of social unity, 94–96; limitation of, in social organization, 95, 96; restricting to one authority, 96; government and lawless use of, 305, 306; government unnecessary in fields not involving, 310.
Foreign-born, in the United States, 236, 237, 238.
Freedom, law and, 304, 305; maintenance of order without interference with, 304; and education, 352.
French Revolution, era of social change, 112, 117.

Gambling habit, social consequences of, 67, 68.

Garden cities, 266.
Genetic change, 116.
Geography, as a social study, 11.
Giddings, F. H., areas favorable to development of large societies, 12; patriarchal family system, 184.
Gillin, J. H., prevalence of feeble-mindedness, 41, 42.
Goodwill, as a substitute for force in social organization, 96.
Government, control of basal industries by, 154, 155; relation of class conflict to, 155, 156; origin of, 300, 301; development of, related to economic change, 301, 302; recognition of various classes by, 302; and public opinion, 303; use of force, 304, 305, 306; rights essential to democratic, 307, 308; and industry, 308, 309; administration by, 309, 310; lessening of control of, in certain fields, 310; democratic, distinguished from democratic society, 311; limitations upon autocratic, 312; failure of democratic through group partiality, 313; democracy in society aided by democratic, 313, 314; national and world, 314, 315.
Great War, result of culture-contact, 112; illustration of war as method of conflict, 161–63.
Greece, era of social change seen in contact with East, 111.
Greek traditions, transfer of, to life of Western World, 103.
Group words, 32.
Groups, universality of, 5; as unit in social life, 35; character-forming, 60; varieties of, 88; stability of, 88; primary and secondary, 91, 92; force as means of unifying, 94–96; production of wealth by, 144, 145; loyalty developed by, 330.

Habit, relation to inborn nature, 56, 58, 59; as socially developed human nature, 56, 57; physiological nature of, 57; social aspect of, 57; and growth, 57, 58; as culture, 70–73.
Habits, effort of society to develop valuable, 59; social danger of fixed nature of, 59; improvement of, based on group life, 60; degenerate, 62–68; developed by primary groups, 92; degenerate, as causes of crime, 320, 321.
Hankins, F. H., comparison of mental capacities of negro and white races, 51.
Hayes, E. C., prevalence of feeble-mindedness, 42; causes of crime, 321.
Health, education and income in relation to, 191, 192; in rural communities, 259, 260; problem of city, 267–75.
Hebrew tradition, transfer of, to Christian religion, 103.
Heredity, fact of evolution, 4; cause of delinquency, 209; and crime, 319, 320.
History, importance of, in relation to societies, 7.
Home, intellectual and moral education in, 185; protector of childhood, 185; ownership of, 188, 264; desirability of, for dependent children, 207; as background of delinquency, 210.
Hoover, Herbert, child-labor laws, 216.
Housing, family life effected by congestion in, 188; problem of, in cities, 264–67; code, 266; community attempts to improve, 266, 267; effect on health of inferior, 267.
Hoxie, R. F., effect of industrial revolution on labor, 287.
Human nature, importance of biological aspects of, 18; inborn and acquired, 25, 26; description of inborn beginnings of, 26, 27; complexity of, 38; acquired, 56–60.

Idiot, definition of, 41.
Illiteracy, among negroes and immigrants, 243; in rural communities, 259; in relation to school, 347.
Imbecile, definition of, 41.
Imitation, compared to suggestion, 33; suggestion, and sympathy, description of, 83.
Immigrants, poverty among, 241, 242; study of crime record of, 242, 243; illiteracy of, 243; insanity record of, 243; protection of, 247; colonies of, retard assimilation, 247, 248.
Immigration, age distribution in relation to, 20; characteristics of American, 236, 237; causes of, in the U.S., 237, 238; *new* and *old*, 237; race or blood mixture through, 238–40; regulation of, on basis of inheritance, 239; introduction of cheap labor through, 240; over-emphasis of racial aspect of, 240; economic aspects of, 240, 241; social aspects of, 241–44; poverty an accompaniment of, 241, 242; illiteracy record for *new* and *old*, 244; transient tendency among *new* and *old*, 244; policy to be

followed in regard to, 244–46; Commission, 1911 report of, 245; laws, 245; problem of assimilation, 246, 247.
Impulses, inborn, 26.
Inborn nature, function of, 29, 30; direction and ordering of, 36; inheritance of, 40; differences in, between races, 49; relation of habit to, 56, 58, 59; invention as illustration of difference in, 100.
Income, distribution of, in Great Britain and the United States, 148; in relation to health, 191, 192, 205.
Individual, not the unit in social life, 35.
Industrial democracy, 227.
Industrial life, as factor in social unity, 118.
Industrial organization, successive stages of, 226.
Industrial Relations, Commission on, report on wages in 1916, 152.
Industrial revolution, mechanical phase of, 231; reorganization of business occasioned by, 231, 232; growth of population caused by, 232; redistribution of population a result of, 233–35; criticism of social institutions caused by, 233; change in social classes due to, 233; immigration and cities related aspects of, 252; effect of, on position of labor, 287, 288.
Industrial training, in schools, 343; for girls, 343, 344.
Industrial-welfare laws, 216.
Industry, destructiveness of conflict in, 122; relation of negro to, 135; governmental control of, 154, 155; use of discussion as method of conflict in, 168; effect of, on modern family life, 186–89; women in, 199–201; demand for child workers in modern, 215, 216; preparation for adult work not afforded by, 219; stages in development of, 227, 228; effect of immigration on, 240, 241; an agency of immigrant assimilation, 248; effect of mechanization of, on worker, 284, 285; concentration of ownership in, 285, 286; government and, 308, 309; school to fit youth for, 341.
Infant mortality, money cost of, 270.
Influence, as a social fact, 85, 86.
Inheritance, influence of social, 3; of race characteristics, 47; basis of class division, 143; of wealth, social control of, 150; regulation of immigration on basis of, 239.
Insanity, prevalence of and measures for elimination of, 43, 44; philanthropy in relation to, 44; effect of alcohol in regard to, 64; among immigrants, 243.
Instincts, inadequacy of human, 27, 28; nature and limitations of, 27, 28; need for control and education of, 28; first and second orders of, 28; social necessity for recognizing, 29, food and sex, 30, 31; balance among, 37.
'Institutional homes,' for dependent children, 207.
Institutions, character of, 179–82; basis of social order, 179, 180; interrelations of, 179, 180; social evolution basis of changes in, 180; functions of, 181, 283; control of members of society through, 181, 182; social, criticism of, due to industrial revolution, 233; formation of character by "primary," 329, as fundamental educational factors, 335.
Intelligence, variations in, 39, 40; social value of measuring, 40.
Intermarriage, between black and white, 133, 134.
International government, 314.
International organization, to prevent war, 163.
Interstimulation, 56, 57.
Invention, modification of nature through, 15; effect of culture on, 71; as illustration of difference in inborn nature, 100; as cause of social change, 108, 109; cumulative and based on culture, 108; dependent on contact of mind with stream of culture, 109; varied fields of, 109, 110.
Isolation, opposed to diffusion, 81; race conflict intensified by, 128; basis of rural backwardness, 258.

Jackson, L. F., description of changes in mountain society, 81.
James, William, redirection of fighting instinct, 36.
Japanese, on the Pacific Coast, 136, 137; history of, in the United States, 138, 139.
Justice, central principle of political order, 304; interference with liberty should be based on, 304; rich favored in dispensation of, 313.
Juvenile court, 213, 214.

King, W. I., ownership of wealth, 148.
Knowledge, school and development of, 336, 337; growth of, 338, 340.

Kraepelin, E., mental illness due to alcohol, 64.

Labor, and capital as classes, 151; organization of, 153; struggle of, to improve position, 153–55; leaders for conflict and for coöperation in, 173, 174; mobility of, a factor in modern family life, 187, 188; in agriculture reduced by machinery, 254; machinery and, 283–85; conflict between capital and, 286–88; effect of industrial revolution on position of, 287, 288; organization of, 287; "three fears" of, 297.
Labor union, an agency of immigrant assimilation, 248.
Laborers, description of types of, 293, 294.
Land-ownership, concentration of, 148, 149.
Language, form of communication, 78.
Large-scale production, development of, 232.
Lathrop, Julia, home life for children, 208.
Law, as part of custom, 102; little improvement in divorce through, 197; and freedom, 304, 305; meaning of, 305; and individual obligation, 306, 307; rights conferred by, 306, 307; need for easy methods of changing, 307.
Leadership, low order of, developed in crowds, 90; problem of, in coöperation, 172; of conflict and coöperative organization, 173.
Leisure, city problem of, 279; teaching proper use of, 343.
Lescohier, D. D., description of types of laborers, 293.
Life, increase in length of human, 268.
Life-cycle, similarity of history of society to, 72.
Liquor habit, and social welfare, 62, 63; opposition to, 63; part played by saloon in development of, 65, 66; methods of social control of, 66.
Literacy test, 245.
Loyalty, an essential basis of social control, 330.
Lynching, as example of crowd action, 91; lawless use of force, 306.

Machinery, growth of cities due to, 254; and labor, 283–85; effect of, on mind of worker, 284, 285; concentration of ownership of, 285, 286.
Males, excess in number over females, 19; preponderance of, in pioneer populations, 19.
Marketing, as an agricultural problem, 255.
Marriage, effect of war on rate of, 192; disease contracted through, 193.
Marriage age, population differences in, 20.
Mental capacity, social value of measuring, 40.
Mental types, Thorndike's three varieties of, 39.
Migration, blending of human characteristics through, 13; dependent on food supply, 13; social changes caused by, 107, 108; causes of, 234, 235; limitations upon, 235; result of, 235.
Militarization, through war, 160.
Mind, variation in capacity and type of, 39, 40.
Minimum wages, 216, 217, 296.
Modified nature, influence of, on man, 14.
Monopoly, social tendencies toward, 164; various forms of, 165; and competition, aim of society in regulation of, 166; control of, as remedy for poverty, 297.
Moral standards, as part of custom, 102; development of social welfare through, 325; strengthening of, through reflection, 325, 326; teaching of, 326; variation in, 326, 327; influence of, 327; building of, 327, 328; inner and outer conformance to, 328; identification of religion with, 331; enforcement of, by religion, 332.
Mores, description of, 101, 102.
Moron, definition of, 41.
Morrill Act, 349.
Moving pictures, as form of commercialized recreation, 277; need for improvement of, 278; influence toward crime, 319.
Mueller-Lyer, F. C., power of social organization, 225.

Nations, conflicts between, 140–43.
Native capacity, not dependent on social class, 45.
Natural environment, technical environment in distinction to, 16, 17.
Natural laws, importance of discovery of, 15.
Natural resources, importance to man, 11–13; varying importance of, through

modification, 14, 15; effect of, on size of populations, 21.
Nature, a limitation and basis of social life, 15.
Negro, as blood problem of America, 50–52; comparative attainment of, as determined by army tests, 51; rate of increase of, as compared to whites, 51; history of, in the United States, 131; possibilities of adjustment between black and white, 131, 132; causes of high proportion of criminality of, 133; intermarriage between white race and, 133, 134; effect of migration of, to North and West, 134, 135; relation of, to industry, 135; education of, 135, 136; illiteracy of, 243.
Negro population, concentration of, in "black belt," 132; slow growth of, in United States, 133; proportion of mixed blood in, 134.
Negro race, two divergent estimates of, 130.
Night schools, 350.

Order, problem of freedom in maintenance of, 304.
Oriental races, conflict with white population on Pacific Coast, 136, 137.
Ownership, concentration of, in industry, 285, 286.

Panunzio, C. M., on race prejudice, 139.
Parmelee, M., on poverty, 291; on crime, 318, 319, 320.
Patriarchal family, early development of, 184, 228, 229.
Pauperism, to be distinguished from ordinary poverty, 292, 293.
Philanthropy, in relation to feeble-mindedness and insanity, 44.
Physical nature, influence of, on society, 11–13; modification of, by man, 13–15.
Plants, domestication of, 229, 230.
Play, a factor in delinquency, 210.
Playgrounds, and crime reduction, 319.
Population, differences, description of, 18; distribution of sexes in, 18, 19; varying age distributions in, 19, 20; two factors in growth of, 20; vitality differences in, 20, 21; size of, 21–23, 190; sex instinct basis of continuance of, 183; characteristics of, 190; problems of quality of, 190, 191; growth of, caused by industrial revolution, 232; redistribution of, due to industrial revolution, 233–35; four factors involved in redistribution of, 235; immigration and city movement phases of redistribution of, 236.
Poverty, inborn ability and, 44, 45; underlying cause of high child death rate, 205; a factor in delinquency, 210, 211; a cause of child labor, 217; among immigrants, 241, 242; relation of sickness to, 271–74; challenge to economic order, 288; of the masses, 288–98; nature of, 289; real test of evil of, 289; extent of, 289–92; periods of, in life of wage-earner, 291, 292; causes of, 292–95; a class problem, 295; inadequacy of charity to remedy, 295; suggested remedies for, 295–97; social minimum standards as remedy for, 296, 297; control of monopoly as remedy for, 297; relation of conflict between capital and labor to, 297; taxation means of meeting, 297; consequences of, 297, 298; as source of crime, 318.
Praise, or blame, social control through, 34.
Press, public opinion developed by, 303; control of, 303, 304; as influence toward crime, 319; as means of education, 350, 351.
Printing, improvement of communication through, 78.
Private property, assumed social function of, 144–46; increased production of wealth through, 146; social limits placed on acquisition of, 146; production not necessarily involved in acquisition of, 146, 147; for use, and property for power, 150; basis of social conflict, 151; created by society to serve society, 155. *See also* Wealth.
Production, encouraged through private ownership, 144–47; factors involved in, 147; question of control of processes of, 149, 152, 153; social nature of, 223; increase of, due to industrial revolution, 232; two characterizations of present methods of, 284.
Progress, dependent on development of tools and speech, 225; and elimination of social evils, 356–58.
Propaganda, in the press, 351.
Protective legislation, for children, 216, 217.
Public library, as extension of school, 351.
Public opinion, relation of class conflict to, 155, 156; developed by the press,

303; government and the making of, 303; rights essential to making of, 308.
Public school systems, development of, 340.
Punishment, or rewards, social means of giving praise or blame, 34; revenge and intimidation involved in, 315, 316; theories of, 315–17; prevention more important than, 316; may increase crime, 321.

Race, physical marks of, 48; limited knowledge of qualities of, 54; why differences in, lead to conflict, 127–30.
Races, slight difference between, in inborn capacity, 49; constituting American people, 50; importance of measuring mental abilities of, 52; intermingling and lack of purity of, 52, 53; mixture of, through immigration, 238–40.
Race characteristics, inheritance of, 47.
Race conflict, 127–40; due to economic competition, 128; intensified by isolation, 128; illustrations of, 129; possibilities of future, 129; physical and cultural differences basis of, 127, 128; between white and Oriental races, 136–39.
Race differences, due more to social inheritance than to inborn nature, 99.
Race-prejudice, 49.
Radical, abolition of custom demanded by, 101.
Recreation, city, 275–80; social nature of, 275; difficulty of providing, 275; commercialized, 276, 277; saloon as commercialized, 276; commercial dance-hall, 276, 277; moving pictures, 277; relation of level of, to industrial conditions, 277, 278; social provision for city, 278–80; control of level of, 279, 280; relation to crime, 318, 319.
Reflection, strengthening of moral standards through, 325, 326.
Relationships, in social units, 2, 3.
Religion, as a factor in social unity, 118; withdrawal of government from field of, 310; stages in evolution of, 330, 331; identification with moral standards, 331; moral idealism enforced by, 332.
Renaissance, era of social change, 111, 112.
Research bureaus, for directing of community improvement, 353.
Restriction of immigration, policy of, 244, 245; directed toward individuals rather than races, 246.
Revolution, caused by resistance to social change, 117.
Rewards, and punishments, social means of giving praise or blame, 34.
Rights, protection of, through law, 307; essential to democratic government, 307, 308.
Roman tradition, influence of, on modern life and thought, 104.
Rosanoff, alcohol and insanity, 64.
Ross, E. A., relative proportion of sexes, 19; failure to recognize social change, 115; government and industry, 308, 309.
Rountree, B. S., periods of poverty in life of wage-earner, 291, 292.
Rural life, problems of, 255–61; social aspects of, 258–60; possibilities of social betterment of, 260, 261; community coöperation for betterment of, 261; inadequacy of, for good educational results, 336.
Rural health, 259, 260, 261.
Rural education, 258–60.
Russell, Bertrand, fear and hope, 36.
Russell, J. E., indictment of schools, 348.

Saloon, group environment provided by, 63; part played by, in development of liquor habit, 65, 66; as form of commercialized recreation, 276.
School, attendance laws, 216; failure to hold pupils cause of child labor, 217; child welfare standards set by, 220; an agency of immigrant assimilation, 248; and development of knowledge, 336, 337; growth of, 339, 340; curriculum of, 341, 342; three aims in curriculum of, 342–44; problem of vocational training in, 342; control of, 345–47; illiteracy in relation to, 347; expenditures, 348; inequality of opportunity afforded by, 348; varying length of attendance in, 348; special types of, 349, 350.
Segregation, for elimination of feeble-mindedness, 43.
Selection, a fact of evolution, 4.
Self-government, implied by democracy, 313.
Serfdom, appearance of, 230.
Settlements, as agencies of coöperation, 173.
Sex, necessity for education in problems of, 198.

Sex instincts, 30, 31, 183.
Sexes, distribution of, in population, 18, 19.
Sickness, social cost of, 267–69; prevalence of, depends on social knowledge, 268; social attitude toward, 268; money cost of, 269–71; relation of, to poverty, 271–73; causes of, in factories, 271; relation of, to crime, 271; and human suffering, 273, 274; measures to prevent, 274, 275.
Slavery, existing ideas of, 151; displaced by wage-contract, 226, 227.
Slosson, E. E., *Fall of Energy and the Rise of Man*, 14.
Smith, R. H., justice partial to rich, 313.
Social authority, and social control, 300.
Social capillarity, 23.
Social change, 106–12; planned and unplanned, 106, 107; caused by immigration and war, 107, 108; caused by invention, 108, 109; eras of, 110–12; three main types of, 110; necessary for social welfare, 114, 115; failure of custom to meet, 114; resistance to, 115, 116; direction of, 116–18; value of planned as opposed to unplanned, 116; need for regular and continuous, 116, 117; *telic* and *genetic*, 116; toleration and compromise essential to orderly, 117.
Social contact, importance of, 12.
Social control, praise and blame as factors in, 34; through institutions, 181, 182; social authority and, 300; crime and, 315; through standards of conduct, 324; loyalty an essential basis of, 330.
Social culture, historical development of, 98.
Social differences, lessened by contact of cultures, 99.
Social environment, nature of, 6; delinquency caused by unfavorable, 209; education afforded man by, 335.
Social evils, progress and elimination of, 356–58.
Social evolution, fundamental facts of, 4; stages in, 4; institutional relationships found in, 180; dependent on development of tools and speech, 225.
Social function, as measure of worth, 117, 118; of private property, 145; of institutions, 181, 283.
Social heritage, influence of, 3; nature of, 5; basis of individual's acquired nature, 60; as means of social unity, 97; power of, 98, 99; description of historical development of, 98; origin of likeness and difference in, 99–101; transfer of, from one people to another, 102–104; the transmitting of, 337, 338.
Social instinct, importance of, 32.
Social minimum standards, as remedy for poverty, 296, 297.
Social opinion, instinctive reaction to, 34.
Social organization, and economic activity, interrelation of, 15–17.
Social organization, weakening of, through war, 162; institutions basis of, 179, 180; importance of, in social evolution, 225.
Social progress, dependent on substitution of coöperation for conflict, 175.
Social sciences, study of, in schools, 344, 345.
Social unit, relationship between members of, 2.
Social unity, custom most important factor in, 118, 119; religion a factor in, 118; industrial life a factor in, 118.
Social welfare, social change essential to, 114, 115.
Socialism, opposition to private ownership of means of production, 149.
Society, importance of study of, 1; different types of, 2; contagion in, 33.
Sociology, a study of human relations, 2.
Specialization, coöperation essential to, 16.
Speech, progress dependent on development of, 225.
Spencer, Herbert, on gambling, 68.
Standard of living, effect of, on size of populations, 22; related to restriction of birth rate, 194; birth rate largely determined by, 194; migration influenced by, 235.
Standards, nature and influence of, 102.
State, as final authority for use of force, 96; as society organized for social control, 300.
Steam engine, importance of invention of, 231.
Sterilization, for elimination of feeble-mindedness, 43.
Stoddard, L., *The Rising Tide of Color*, 129.
Strikes, weapon of labor, 153; problem of controlling, 154; substitution of arbitration for, 154.
Struggle, to live, a social impulse, 32; fundamental to social progress, 121; pro-

ductive opposed to destructive or deceptive methods of, 124–26.
Sub-races, European, 48, 49.
Suggestion, compared to imitation, 33; -imitation-sympathy complex, 33; imitation, and sympathy, description of, 83; -imitation, 83; shown through fashion, custom, and tradition, 84; key to nature of crowds, 89.
Sympathy, an inborn tendency, 32–35; suggestion, and imitation, description of, 83.

Taft, W. H., rich favored in dispensation of justice, 313.
Tarde, M. G., suggestion-imitation, 83.
Taussig, F. W., distribution of wealth in Great Britain, 148.
Taxation, as means of meeting poverty, 297.
Technical environment, in distinction to natural environment, 16, 17.
Technique, or modification of nature by man, 13–15; effect of, on size of populations, 22; and social organization, 224–27.
Telic change, 116.
Ten Commandments, example of mores, 102.
Tenant-farming, increase of, in U.S., 257.
Thorndike, E. L., assistance rather than opposition from natural tendencies, 30; variations in intelligence, 40.
Toleration, essential to orderly change, 117.
Tools, progress determined by development of, 225.
Transportation, a means of communication, 79, 80; relation to housing problem, 266.
Tuberculosis, money cost of, 270; among wage-earning class, 270.

Unemployment insurance, 296.
Unit of conflict, based on unit of social life, 140, 141.

Variability, a fact of evolution, 4.
Variation, in capacity and type of mind, 39–41.
Vitality, population difference in, 20, 21.
Vocational selection, through competition and struggle, 122.
Vocational training, problem of, in schools, 342.

Wage, problem of, 151, 152; received by women, 200; contract, substituted for slavery, 226, 227; low level of, created by immigration, 241.
Wallas, G., three great fields of coöperative organization, 172.
War, possibility of prevention of, 36; social changes caused by, 107, 108; destructiveness of, 122, 123, 160, 161; conflict through, 159–63; early, 159, 160; waged by organizing unit of social life, 160; Great War used to illustrate, as method of conflict, 161–63; economic aspects of, 161; loss of life through, 161; biological effects of, 161, 162; weakening of social organization through, 162; international organization to prevent, 163; effect on births and rate of marriage, 192; as origin of government, 300, 301.
Warner, A. G., sickness and poverty, 272.
Waste, social progress through elimination of, 356.
Wealth, basis of class division, 143, 144; struggle for, involves group competition, 144; production of, by groups, 145; increased production of, through private property, 146; basis of conflict, 146; three methods of obtaining, 146; distribution of, in Great Britain and the United States, 148; criticism of existing ownership of, 147–51; social control of inheritance of, 150; production of, a social fact, 223; surplus, through domestication of animals, 228; increase of, due to industrial revolution, 232; concentration of, 285, 286; redistribution of, as remedy for poverty, 296; development of government to control ownership of, 301, 302.
Weyl, W. E., immigration and democracy in industry, 240; problem of unassimilated foreigners, 249.
White race, varieties of, in America, 52.
Willcox, W. H., decline of negro population, 51, 52.
Williams, W. C., movement of rural population to city, 259.
Women, change in position of, 195, 196, 199; in industry, 199–201.
Work environment, nature of, 15, 16.
Work, a factor in delinquency, 210; relation of, to level of recreation, 278; and mind of worker, 284, 285.