PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME VIII

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Agents

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO

KARL W. HIERSEMANN
LEIPZIG

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS

EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

HELD AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
DECEMBER 27, 29, 30, 1913

VOLUME VIII

PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL ASSIMILATION

PUBLISHED FOR THE
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY
BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Published July 1914

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A VISION OF SOCIAL EFFICIENCY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

ALBION W. SMALL
University of Chicago

The less numerous of the two prominent British schools of sociology cherishes the proposition that the business of sociology is to construct social ideals. There is no evidence to show whether or not that view would be adopted by the American Sociological Society. I should certainly not accept it as a definition of the functions of Sociology. On the other hand, I have scant respect for any sociological technique which does not at last contribute to credible forecasts of better things in the future, and thus at least indirectly to foreshadowings of improved society in general, along with partial revelations of ways and means of achieving those improvements.

Accordingly I shall take the liberty this evening of throwing science to the winds, and of installing imagination in its place. I do not call what I am to say *Sociology*. It is that better type of thing than can be produced by any strictly cognitive process whatever. It is the composite outlook upon life projected upon the background of the thinker's total knowledge, with the assistance of all the intellectual processes at his command, but at last frankly toned and colored by his own personal estimate of all the values involved. This testimony may have little intrinsic value, but at all events it is the thinker's own. It reflects an authentic self. It is an actual human reaction, and as such it is entitled to its proportionate place among the evidences which go to establish the conclusions of life. Accordingly, without committing Sociology or the American Sociological Society to the slightest responsibility for what I am saying, I shall allow myself the luxury of sketching the picture of a relatively rational society which my own judgment projects.

As a vanishing-point for the picture, let us suppose that the occupants of the cabin of the "Mayflower," when the famous pact

was drawn and signed, were not the historical company, but the present members of the American Sociological Society. Suppose further that by some preternatural discernment these adventurers were able to bring before their view our present national domain, with its present population, its present technical equipment, its present accumulations of wealth, its present scientific methods and results, yet without an inkling of the present political and economic organization, or of the social stratification. Let us suppose also that the company had not the Pilgrims' type of social consciousness, but ours—for when the imagination decides to take liberties it is foolish to scrimp them. While we are about it, we may as well abstract our social consciousness, as far as it is a complex of valuations, from our knowledge of national history and present conditions, although this knowledge has been a chief factor in forming the valuations.

Now then, with this forecast of scope for action, and of the numbers of actors to be concerned, and of the types of achievement designated, and with our present criteria of social values as our standard, what would be our idea of the quality of relations fit to form the social framework of the millions who should succeed to these national resources, and accomplish the aggregate results that are familiar to us today?

As I have taken pains to confess, the answer that I am to give may not be the answer of the members of the Sociological Society at all. It is merely my own answer. Yet in order to avoid as much as possible the first-personal form, while admitting the substance, I indulge the fancy that the Society is of one mind in this matter and that I am merely the mind-reader.

Sweeping the spatial perspective then from Provincetown to the Golden Gate, and the temporal expanse from 1620 to 1914 and on to our farthest reach into the future, what stipulations would we make for the spirit and purposes of the society destined to carry on that section of humanity's process which is to occupy the quota of space and time allotted to the American people?

While I can speak with authority of my own opinion alone, I still have no doubt that, if we could agree on the meaning of the

words, so that we should not fear that to some of us some of them would mean one thing and to some another, there would be substantial unanimity in this Society along the following lines. They are specifications of the general conception which we entertain of our whole national experience, of the physical conditions which make that experience possible, of the goal toward which that experience is to be directed, as fast as it becomes conscious, and of the operative principles which will insure the efficiency of the experience. The form in which I recite the items is not that of law-givings for the enterprise, but of presumptions, or prophetic forelookings which we should rely upon as the matrix in which, from time to time, constitutions and statutes and ordinances in pursuance of these valuations would grow.

We should presume then, *first*, that as a matter of course the enormous enterprise of utilizing this space and time, these material deposits and physical energies and moral opportunities, is a *community* undertaking; an affair of co-operation in duties and copartnership in enjoyments; with the common interest always effectively paramount to minor aims.

We should assume, *second*, that the innermost and ultimate meaning of the whole undertaking is not to be found in its mastery of physical conditions, but in its transmuting of this control of forces into realization of types of persons surpassing one another, generation after generation, in progressive realization of completer physical and mental and moral attainments.

We should take it for granted, *third*, that the total of external resources will always be regarded as a trust to be administered by the community as an endowment for the *human* process in which the enterprise finds its ultimate expression.

We should regard it as settled, *fourth*, that the undertaking will always be conducted with a view to encouragement, in each individual, of every excellence, and the highest degree of every excellence which can be harmonized with the efficiency of the whole process of human development.

We should be confident, *fifth*, that all normal adults concerned in the undertaking will be agreed that certain regulative principles

of conduct are indispensable. They will consequently be sure that all the resources of the community must be pledged to the procuring of conduct consistent with these principles.

That is, a system of control will be demanded which will be inexorable in its insistence upon certain conduct held by the general community judgment to be necessary for the good of the whole. The system of control will shade off into non-compulsion and even non-prescription and non-intervention in the degree in which it is the consensus of the community that, in certain ranges of conduct, spontaneity of action makes more for the good of the whole than group constraint.

Sixth: Because the "realization of completer human types" and "the good of the whole" are concepts which must redefine each other in an incessant reciprocity during the term of this enterprise, we should anticipate that the system of control will be flexible, and adaptable, both in its structure and in its functions, to the changing implications of the undertaking.

Consequently, types of conduct which may be secured by forcible means at one stage of the process may not need to be required nor even enjoined at another. Thus the system of control may never usurp the place of an absolute authority. On the contrary, in its structure, its policies, and its programs the system of control must always be itself controlled by the evolving requirements of the enterprise.

It would be understood, *seventh*, that there will be no arbitrary limitations upon the freedom of each normal adult member of the community to exercise his abilities in promotion of the enterprise, and that the partnership of each in all the franchises and emoluments of the undertaking will correspond with the value of his contribution to the common operations.

We should foresee, *eighth*, that from year to year and from decade to decade the enterprise will show an increasing surplus of material and spiritual goods. This accumulation will of course be held as a trust fund by the community, and it will be used as a special endowment to reinforce those operations which in the general interest from time to time most require stimulation. Experience will develop a code of equity to govern the administration of this

material and spiritual wealth. It will be dedicated to the assistance of all persons and processes that increasing enlightenment discovers to be worthy of exceptional support. It will be jealously guarded against concession in the form of permanent privilege, and it will be held without prejudice at the service of every interest in the community which needs temporary encouragement in developing activities that give assurance of contributing ultimately to the good of the whole.

We should have no doubt, *ninth*, that those persons who, more through misfortune than through culpable fault, are only slightly or not at all able to contribute to the common enterprise will be enlisted for the most useful employments of which they are capable, and that the deficit between their services and a reasonable appraisal of their needs will be a charge upon the insurance reserve.

We should be agreed, *tenth*, that those persons who, more by their own choice than by misfortune, are unfit to contribute to the common enterprise will be held to such disciplinary constraints by the community that they will acquire some social fitness, and that they will at length prefer a tolerable measure of usefulness in the general undertaking to the alternative constraint.

In the case of persons whose social unfitness is due in part to the predetermining negligence of the society, attempts to correlate these persons with the whole functional process will have due regard to the different causes of the abnormality, and will always be guided by supreme reference to establishment of normality, both in the erring society and in the delinquent individual.

We should look forward, *eleventh*, to progressive recognition of gradations in the scale of accredited values. That is, material values will be appraised in the proportion of the uses of the respective things to people, and moral values will rank in accordance with the social worth of the various types and qualities of human activity.

It would follow, *twelfth*, that adequate provision must be made for the function of keeping all the members of the community aware of the reciprocal nature of the enterprise in which they are engaged, and of the implied liabilities of all to each and of each to all.

For similar reasons, *thirteenth*, a part of the common undertaking

must always be to see that no specific plans adopted or permitted by the community should tend to prejudice the general purpose.

It would be our conviction, *fourteenth*, that the general purpose will be prejudiced if either of the following things occurs:

a) If tendencies are tolerated which give to some types of people more than their proportional share of the returns of the enterprise, or which deprive other types of any portion of their due share of those returns.

b) If tendencies are tolerated which encourage the increase of less desirable types of persons, or which discourage the increase of more desirable types.

c) In particular, if tendencies are tolerated which make it possible for some people to enjoy without being useful, and which veto other people's will to be useful for the sake of enjoying.

d) If it becomes harder for some parts of the community than for others to obtain justice.

e) If the belief becomes current among some members of the community that the best way to get their rights is to repudiate parts of their obligations.

f) If a creed becomes current that things are more important than people.

g) If, whether as cause or effect of this creed, programs become fixed which set the interests of wealth above the interests of people.

Fifteenth, and finally, but first and constantly the precondition of all the rest: we should presuppose that the members of the community will be instant, in season and out of season, in discovering for themselves, and in passing along to their children, zeal for discovering every accessible detail and interpretation of knowledge which may reveal conditions upon which promotion of the whole moral enterprise depends; and which especially may disclose failures of the persons concerned to apply their resources and abilities most efficiently to promotion of the undertaking.

Please observe that I have not referred to this scheme as a vision of social *righteousness*, or a vision of social *justice*, or a vision of social *reform*. There might be a suspicion of something weakly sentimental about such visions. I have been talking about the literal business in which humanity is engaged; the most matter-of-fact

affair which mundane people have on their hands—this central and circumferential business of transforming all the resources of the world into the highest grade of physical, mental, and moral persons evolvable out of the given elements. I have been enumerating some of the basic requirements of *efficiency* in this business. Such intelligence as we possess tells us that the large business of life is not economically conducted unless it sustains the efficiency test which these specifications enforce.

Of course, the vision which I have drawn reminds us all of our own social system. Far be it from me to assert that the United States of America, the most enlightened country of the world, the path-breaker of human freedom, the pacemaker of moral progress, is deficient in a single one of these particulars! This is a time for felicitation. Carpings and criticisms would be bad form. Besides, the newspapers of the Twin Cities are doubtless not behind cosmopolitan journalism in general in their promptness to denounce the due damnation of a pessimist upon the ill-advised academic theorist who in public betrays a doubt that everything American is not only the best that ever was, but the best that ever can be. No! I am not the pessimist that the reporters dearly love to find in academic circles. There have been savage peoples that have not come up to the mark which our vision sets. Possibly trivial details of it are not yet in full force in Dahomey and Tibet and Mexico; but "practical" Americans are assuredly not lacking in anything that pertains to efficiency! Wherefore my epilogue is evidently à propos of nothing in particular. I am simply musing, as the manner of some is when their minds are not otherwise engaged.

I recall that one of the differences between an individual and a society is that the latter may actually begin where a completed cycle of its career ends, and may shape a later type of career in the light of its previous experience. Individuals frequently ring changes on the futile reflection: "If I could live my life over again, knowing what I do now, I could do better." In the case of the individual this is less certain than is assumed. Societies actually may, and so long as they are virile they actually do, reconstruct themselves after failure and even disaster. Germany did it after the Thirty Years' War. England did it after the second probation

of the Stuarts. France did it after the Revolution and again after the *débacle*.

The social problem of the twentieth century is whether the civilized nations can restore themselves to sanity after their nineteenth-century aberrations of individualism and capitalism.

Bear with me for pointing out that I have neither said nor implied that the actual company in the "Mayflower" ought to have seen as far as we see into the functional requirements of civilization as highly evolved as ours. It was not their fault that they did not see all that we can. It is not our merit that we see more than they could. The judgment of history upon us will turn, however, upon the programs which we follow since meaning factors of the human problem which our predecessors could not see have been forced on our attention.

Referring to these factors in the most summary way, there are four functional fallacies in the institutions of modern civilized states; four radical ignorings of the demands of social efficiency:

First: The fallacy of treating capital as though it were an active agent in human processes, and of crediting income to the personal representatives of capital irrespective of their actual share in human service.

Second: The fallacy of excluding the vast majority of the active workers in capitalistic industries from representation in control of the businesses in which they function.

Third: The fallacy of *incorporating* the fallacious capitalistic principle, thus promoting the legal person to an artificial advantage over natural persons, and consequently, by social volition, giving the initial fallacy cumulative force by an uncontrolled law of accelerated motion.

Of course I am not asserting that incorporation in itself is a social fallacy, but only incorporation inadequately controlled by the whole social process. Corporations as they will one day be articulated into the inclusive human process will be as different from corporations as they are as the wrench serving the uses of a skilled mechanic is from the wrench thrown into the machinery.

Fourth: The fallacy of a system of inheritance which assigns the powers and privileges of incorporated capital to sentimentally

designated individuals, instead of reserving their benefits primarily to the actively functioning agents of society. This fourth fallacy, in conjunction with the other three, creates phenomena of hereditary economic sovereignty which must eventually become more intolerable than the hereditary political sovereignties overthrown by the republican revolutions.

Back of these four fallacies of operation is a malignantly subservient fallacy of logic. It is the naïve sophistry of dogmatizing an obvious analogy into an identity. The analogy starts with homely everyday aspects of the lives of types of persons who are every day growing more rare in capitalistic societies, but it shades off by imperceptible degrees into the radically different things with which these remote parallels are supposed to be identical. This accounts for the plausibility of the argument, while it is egregiously superficial. In a word, the detached individual, with his labor, his savings, and his implicit right to reasonable freedom in use of his savings, is presumed to be the ground pattern of all the economic rights and duties in present society. Thereupon, what is true of this unaided individual, dealing with similar unaided individuals, is predicated of natural and legal persons alike in their property rights. That is, not merely analogy, but identity of principle is alleged between the literal individual and incorporated capital!

What is incorporated capital? It is a few individuals applying a nucleus of wealth and credit to natural opportunity, *but not with their own unaided powers alone.* It is a few individuals exploiting wealth and credit and opportunity *with the perpetual alliance of the state;* and this alliance is a talisman which confers a virtually magical touch upon the persons incorporated. The increment of power with which the state thus artificially endows corporations makes them social factors with which the powers of natural persons are ridiculously incomparable. This transparent logical fallacy is the key to the theoretical defense of the four chief operative fallacies. The chief social task of the next great stage of civilization will be this—to dissipate this nebulous defense and to install rational substitutes for the fallacious operative principles.

Returning from this digression into literal fact, and resuming for a moment my flight of fancy, I predict that the effective refutation

of these confederated fallacies will receive its next great impulse not from recognition of claims of justice, as between man and man, or class and class, but from discovery that *the combination mightily obstructs social efficiency.*

If it were not commonplace, it would be astonishing that, after so many thousands of years of human history, we have no consensus of opinion as to why we are living at all. I see no reason to believe that we shall ever reach a common conclusion about the ultimate meaning of this planet and the occurrences upon it for the whole cosmic reality in which it is a speck. On the other hand, it looks to me altogether probable that men will one day be substantially agreed in this—that efficiency in living involves as a minimum the utmost correlation of human powers in endeavor after those concerted social achievements which prove by experience to do most toward placing physical resources at the disposal of all the world's people; and which at the same time do most toward inclining all the world's people so to use those resources that they may become progressively admirable people. No sooner has this construction of life commended itself to anyone than he begins to understand that the dominating principle of our capitalistic civilization is a suspensive veto upon realization of this ideal. The illusion that the way to live is to subordinate life to the lifeless thing *capital* is the most astounding of the paganisms.

I do not imagine that the practical refutation of capitalism will be accomplished when proof is furnished that the system is not efficient in producing progressively admirable people. That might pass as a nonessential, to be worried about by no one except pedagogues and preachers. It doubtless would not powerfully interest the type of people whose measure of the world's efficiency is dividends. But more to the immediate point than that, I predict that before long the statisticians and the accountants will begin to show that capitalism is not solvently efficient in raising the funds to pay its own bills. Then the judgment day of capitalism will be due.

For a number of years men wise and simple have been puzzling over the problem of the rising cost of living. Among all our national leaders, not one has had the wit to point out that capitalism steadily increases the overhead charges upon national industry, and that

sooner or later the burden of this increase must be felt in its enlarging ratio to the output. Under the capitalistic system, when we pay for today's dinner we are paying also for dinners served and paid for long ago, and we are also paying instalments on other dinners that will be served generations hence. Yet we go jauntily on adding percentages of yesterday's and tomorrow's accounts to the price of today's dinner, while we marvel at the growing size of the bill!

For example, we are still paying interest on four hundred and forty-one million dollars of national debt incurred previous to 1865. But the interest payments on this sum have already equaled the original loans twice over. Through continuance of the annual interest payments which do not reduce the principal, we are now engaged in discharging those loans a third time. Looking in the other direction, Americans for the next fifty years will be paying at the rate of from 2 to 3 per cent for certain portions of the cost of the Panama Canal. In 1961 or thereabout we shall have repaid the original borrowings to defray these particular portions of the expense. This repayment of the principal, however, will not have retired a single one of the bonds, but the principal and the annual interest will still be due, just as though no payments had been made.

As another type of illustration, it would be easy to schedule improvements of railroad terminals completed or projected in various cities, and bonded to the amount of one hundred million dollars. Nothing affecting the point of the illustration could be gained by attempting to make a complete estimate of this sort of liability. The interest on such bonds will become a permanent charge upon the earnings. It will press down upon wages, and it will lift up on demands for higher traffic rates, while the next twenty-five years are making full return of the principal. Whether the original bonds have a longer or shorter life, they will probably be represented in the funded debt of the companies for an indefinite period. That is, our industries will repay these loans over and over again to the children and children's children of the original lenders, and in the apparently innocent form of a reasonable rate of interest on an honest debt!

My argument would deserve no attention if I asserted that all

capitalistic operations, or even all financing operations, are of this improvident and fallacious type. I neither assert nor believe that this is the case. I do say that this fallacious type of capitalistic operation bulks so large in modern affairs that it may turn out to be the prime factor in our age of transition.

Unless Americans fifty years hence are less stupid than we are today, they will go on repaying old debts an indefinite number of times, and heaping up new ones, while they wonder why it grows harder every day to provide the necessities of life. It is barely possible that the multiplicity of object-lessons may have taught our successors something by the end of another half-century. Perhaps the next generation will have learned that capitalism is not the Utopia in which everyone may eat his cake and have it too. In another fifty years it may have been discovered that capitalism is a merger of famine and lottery. The majority pay for cakes they do not get, and the surplus provides prizes for the minority.

Payments under the head of interest that correspond with value received, including proper rates of wages for the necessary labor and minor charges connected with the transactions, may or may not be items in a needlessly extravagant way of living. In principle they are not otherwise fallacious. The premium element in payments of interest, however—that is, the excess over payment of the principal and fair remuneration for real services connected with the loan—is without justification in economics or in morals, and the civilization which presumes the contrary is riding for a fall. Some day not far off the statisticians will disclose the amount of this premium element loaded upon our national production, and collected from the non-capitalistic classes both in low wages and in high prices of commodities. I do not venture to predict the subsequent course of events.

Not opponents only but supporters of the last three presidents of the United States have reached the conclusion that each of these worthy citizens is convinced that something is the matter with our social system. Each of them is eager to find the remedy. Obviously to others, however, and perhaps also to himself, each is unable to arrive at a convincing diagnosis. The earliest of these chief magistrates thinks that, whatever the difficulty is, its main

evils might be removed by controlling monopoly. The latest of them is equally sure that health may be restored by controlling competition. The intermediate incumbent radiates a hardly less futile optimism in the belief that our social ills would be reduced to a minimum if we would resign ourselves to control by a few masterful gentlemen who on their part do not propose to be controlled at all.

Our program toward the central problems of our time will amount to nothing but impotent and irritating tinkering with details, until the leaders of our thought and action consent to a policy of candid and thorough inquiry as to whether there is something radically mistaken in the capitalistic system itself.

Returning for a moment to my point of departure, it is a more comfortable job to card-index the past or the present than to work on construction of the future. By far the bulk of American scholarship in the social sciences has gravitated in the line of least resistance. We are not doing our share toward helping our confused modern social consciousness to become articulate, and toward concentrating our divergent purposes upon wisely chosen aims. No scholars in the world have had a fairer field than we for durable social service. Reorganization of social relations is going on, with us or in spite of us. It might be a more constructive and less wasteful transformation if the best that we can contribute were cast into the lot with the labors of our fellows. We may consent to be mere bookkeepers of other men's deeds, or we may be "instead of eyes" to men with more force than insight for rational progress.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

ROBERT A. WOODS
South End House, Boston

The institution of the family existed before there was any human nature. It was not humanity which created the family, but in a real sense the family created humanity.

Now the neighborhood is a still more ancient and fundamentally causative institution than the family. It seems likely that the neighborhood, in the shape of gregarious association among the animals, was the necessary matrix in which the subtle reciprocities of the family could find suggestion and protection. Such groups developed really organic quality, as each of them became a "family of families." The clan and the early village community were the dynamic source out of which the foundation principles of all the more broadly organized social forms have been developed.

It is, I believe, one of the most important and one of the most slighted considerations affecting all the social sciences, that the neighborhood relation has a function in the maintenance and progress of our vast and infinitely complicated society today which is not wholly beneath comparison with the function which it exercised in the creative evolution of that society. But there are today signs of a wholly new emphasis, both theoretical and practical, upon the function of the neighborhood as affecting the whole contemporary social process.

The peculiar disregard of the neighborhood in the theoretical and practical counsels of statesmanship, and of the non-governmental administration of society, is to be traced largely to the psychological attitude of social students and social administrators. Once three eminent geographers—Elisee Reclus, Kropotkin, and Patrick Geddes—were engaged in conversation when the question was raised, "If you go to the bottom of your mind, what is the resultant conception of the world which you find there?" They all agreed that it was the one which had been determined by the four-square Mercator's projection-maps in the little textbooks which

they had first studied. Is it not true that in all social studies our minds are inevitably conventionalized by the constant dominance over them, during the whole period of education, of those particular social institutions which are in more or less crystallized form, whose sanctions are obvious and unavoidable, and which project themselves in large and somewhat distant terms? Have we in sociology really passed the stage represented in medicine by the discovery of the circulation of the blood? If so, how far have we come in the study of society to the microscopic observational analysis of ultimate cell life and of germ cultures, as contrasted with the discredited diagnosis of large-scale symptoms?

Aside from any claim of the neighborhood based on past social evolution, it presents the highest contemporary elements of value from the point of view of a developed scientific method, whether theoretical or applied. The neighborhood is large enough to include in essence all the problems of the city, the state, and the nation; and in a constantly increasing number of instances in this country it includes all the fundamental international issues. It is large enough to present these problems in a recognizable community form, with some beginnings of social sentiment and social action with regard to them. It is large enough to make some provision for the whole variety of extra-family interests and attachments, which in the fully developed community are ever more and more obscuring the boundary line that closes the family in upon itself. It is large enough so that the facts and forces of its public life, rightly considered, have significance and dramatic compulsion; so that its totality can arrest and hold a germinating public sense.

On the other hand, it is small enough to be a comprehensible and manageable community unit. It is in fact the only one that is comprehensible and manageable; the true reason why city administration breaks down is that the conception of the city breaks down. The neighborhood is concretely conceivable; the city is not, and will not be except as it is organically integrated through its neighborhoods.

Everybody knows that the battle for sound democratic government, as a battle, is still an affair of sharpshooters and raiders. The center of the army and the rear detachments are not yet

engaged. But this great majority is consciously, keenly, and, up to a certain point, successfully, involved in the democratic administration of neighborhood affairs. The neighborhood is the vital public arena to the majority of men, to nearly all women, and to all children; in which every one of them is a citizen, and many of them, even among the children, are statesmen—as projecting and pushing through plans for its total welfare. It is in the gradual public self-revelation of the neighborhood—in its inner public values, and in its harmony of interest with the other neighborhoods—that the reverse detachments of citizenship are to be swung into the battle of good municipal administration and good administration of cultural association in the city at large; it is this process which will turn the balance definitely and decisively in the direction of a humanized system of politics, of industrialism, and of morality.

I am inclined to think that on the whole there is a certain dignity in the sentiment of the neighborhood about itself which is not equaled in fact by any of our other forms of social self-consciousness. The family may be abject; the neighborhood is never so. The city may admit itself disgraced; the neighborhood always considers disgrace foisted upon it. The nation may have its repentant moods; the university and the church may be apologetic under attack; but the neighborhood will tolerate no criticism from without and little from within.

This strong and sometimes exaggerated sense of collective self-respect brings it about that neighborhood leadership, so far as neighborhood affairs are concerned, and if it is to be real and continuous leadership of the people, must be on a basis both of equality and of honest dealings. The local boss, however autocratic he may be in the larger sphere of the city with the power which he gets from the neighborhood, must always be in and of the local people; and he is always very careful not to try to deceive the local people so far as their distinctively local interests are concerned. It is hard to fool a neighborhood about its own neighborhood affairs.

A neighborhood is a peculiarly spontaneous social group. It represents life at all points of human relations, not life on the basis of a few subjective ideas. Its collective sentiment is wrought out of a variety of emotions that have not been generalized and ab-

stracted, and therefore go as directly and certainly into action as those of a normal child. It is not a smooth, cut-and-dried scheme, fashioned by imitation; but a drama full of initiative and adventure. Every day in a neighborhood is a new day. Here social action is discovered out in the open, under full cry. The crowd psychology, the mysterious currents in popular sentiment, which we from time to time can study telescopically in the larger horizon, are in essence constantly alert in the neighborhood.

The neighborhood is the most satisfactory and illuminating form of the social extension of personality, of the interlacing and comprehensive complex of the interplay of personalities; the social unit which can by its clear definition of outline, its inner organic completeness, its hair-trigger reactions, be fairly considered as functioning like a social mind.

Modern conditions of industrial specialization, the mobility of population, and easy intercommunication have brought a degree of disintegration to neighborhood life; but with the exception of some of the downtown sections of the great cities, this disintegration has not proceeded so far as is ordinarily thought. The time has come for a great renewal of confidence in the vitality of the neighborhood as a political and moral unit. Disorganized neighborhoods must by a great and special effort be reconstructed. These and all other neighborhoods which have lost their responsible leadership must by motives of patriotic adventure be provided with such a transfusion of civic blood as will lead to a thorough quickening of the functions of "the family of families." And all normally conditioned local communities must be inspired to the rediscovery in modern terms and under modern standards of achievement of their latent collective energies.

It happens here as in medical science that discoveries are made under the appeal and threat of disease; but the results of experiments with untoward conditions have their great use, not in the cure or even in the prevention of specific degeneracy, but in the promotion and exaltation of the general, normal well-being. The new meaning of the neighborhood as developed at four hundred settlement houses which have sprung up in America during this generation, will find its fulfilment in the next in a national move-

ment for a new synthesis of neighborhood well-being and productive power.

From the point of view of the transfer of social leadership from one local community to another, one of the most striking facts about the neighborhood is that, though it is essentially an intimate circle, it is at bottom always a hospitable one, always ready to receive new recruits. The first impact of a new arrival may be chilling, but in due time the newcomer begins almost automatically to go through the degrees of this greatest and freest of human free-masonries. As Mark Twain has suggested, when a man sits down beside you in the railroad car your first feeling is one of intrusion; but after a little something happens to make your being in the same seat a matter of common interest, and the feeling of recoil dissolves into a continuous friendly glow.

It is surely one of the most remarkable of all social facts that, coming down from untold ages, there should be this instinctive understanding that the man who establishes his home beside yours, by that very act begins to qualify as an ally of yours and begins to have a claim upon your sense of comradeship. Surely this deeply ingrained human instinct is capable of vast and even revolutionary results. Among the unexplored and almost undiscovered assets upon which we must depend for the multiplication of wealth and well-being in the future, may it not be that here in the apparently commonplace routine of our average neighborhoods is the pitch-blende out of which, by the magic of the applied social science that is to come, a new radium of economic and moral productive resource will be elicited?

From this point of view, the science of the community needs its neighborhood laboratories as one of its most essential resources. Nearly all highly educated persons are snatched out of neighborhood experience at an early age, and few of us ever really have it again. Thus our opportunity for the experimental, pragmatic study of typical human relations is lost—lost so far that in most cases we forget that we are suffering loss. Neighborhood impulse is one of the great values of life as to which we forget that we have ever forgotten. As our positive interchange is almost exclusively confined to the one-sixth of the population of our cities and towns

which make the professional and commercial classes—that is the unsettled and unneighborly classes—we are inclined to think of the neighborhood as offering little more challenge to scientific inquiry than our almost faded out neighbor remembrances would suggest. It is in fact necessary that social science as now organized should have a change of heart, a real conversion, as to the endless intellectual interest and inexhaustible capacity for a better social order which lies in neighborhood life everywhere.

As has been suggested, the principal forms of effort leading to neighborhood research lie in experiments directed positively toward the better organization of more or less disintegrated neighborhoods, and conducted chiefly under initiative coming in the first instance from without. The distinguishing watchword of such effort is participation. It is in the hands of persons who live continuously in the neighborhood, and who let whatever of leadership they may have take the sporting chances of winning approval and response from the people of the neighborhood. As the force of neighborhood workers grows, it comes to represent both the line and the staff, the different grades of general administrative officers and the specialists in the different ways of service. There are two contrasted but mutually related ways of attack—first, an ascending scale of more or less formal classes and clubs, beginning with the mothers' prenatal class and reaching up into adult years; and secondly, a great variety of informal effort, principally in the way of visiting up and down the front streets, the side streets, and the back streets—going out into the highways and the hedges—beginning at the outer circumference of the neighborhood and working toward the center.

The more obvious common interests to be developed and directed fall under three main heads: health, vocation, recreation.

The fact that no modern city has yet proved its capacity to reproduce its own population; that one-half of each generation dies before it matures into productive power; that two of the greatest of all the economic wastes are found in infant mortality and child morbidity—comes home to the neighborhood worker in terms of a direct personal human challenge. The proper care and feeding of infants; the development of medical inspection and nursing in connection with the public schools; the local organization of the

campaign against tuberculosis; the securing of public baths, gymnasiums, and playgrounds; the provision of country vacations for the children and young people of congested city quarters; and the insistent development of housing reform—as definite forms of action toward the enhancement of public health—had many of their inevitable beginnings in connection with this motive of neighborhood reorganization; and their progress depends largely upon its continuous, first-hand, intensive contacts. In fact it is historically true that the constructive motive as to the public health is of recent date, and until the last two or three decades nothing really substantial was done by public health authorities in our cities, except by a sort of spasm immediately after an epidemic. The raising of the banner of a human way of life in the poorest and meanest byways of our cities, by persons of intelligence and resource who are themselves actually encountering such serious sanitary evils through dwelling in the midst of them—this has had much to do with bringing about the present great movement of continuous and exhaustive public hygiene in our cities.

It must be remembered that this mighty enterprise, which has already accomplished so much for the human race, for the widest dissemination of practical knowledge as to the care and enhancement of health, cannot accomplish and hold its result unless it reach every doorstep and every fireside. Particularly since the collapse of the institutional method for the upbringing of neglected children, and the return to the problem of reconstructing rather than abolishing even the low-grade family life, it has been seen that very important new responsibilities are to be laid upon average and under-average mothers in relatively resourceless neighborhoods; and that there must be an efficiently led neighborhood system by which those mothers shall be trained and held to their task; that a neighborhood sentiment and a neighborhood gossip must be created and steadily maintained which shall make these mothers in some degree at least mentally and morally equal to the service which civilization must lay upon them.

Another of the greatest wastes is in the loss of productive power through the lack of vocational training. Place a group of earnest young men and women, who have themselves received the best and

most complete training for life which their times afford, in a neighborhood where the great majority of the children end their educational experience without any sort of training for livelihood, and are thrown helpless out into the confusing currents of a great city's activities—and you soon find a group of intense and restless advocates of the vocational extension of our public-school system. The powerful tendency in this direction throughout the country is owing not a little to just such experiences; and the growing realization on the part of working-class parents of the necessity of such education —as shown in the marked change of front recently made upon this subject by organized labor—is the result in an equal degree of the activity of the local social workers.

Supposing it to be true that 15 per cent of the new generation at the most is now receiving some sort of adequate training for the intelligent productive work of life, one of the greatest of all present social tasks is to bring it about that the next 15 per cent shall have its appropriate opportunity for such training. In such effort, as Professor Marshall has pointed out, lies one of the most hopeful avenues for the rapid increase of national wealth. And the bringing it about, the proper encouragement of parents, the proper launching of these youth upon their vocational careers, must come in the first instance at least through effectively organized neighborhood relationships.

The social recreation of young people is in every sort of community a problem of anxious significance; but where the home and the neighborhood have lost their coherence, it is beset continually with moral tragedy. A study of the problem of the young working-girl, which the National Federation of Settlements has been conducting for the past two years,[1] whose results represent the collated evidence of 2,000 social workers, brings out very clearly the fact that as soon as the young girl wage-earner finds that she cannot have in her own neighborhood a satisfying reaction from the strain of work, she is carried by the essential forces of her being into a veritable ambush of moral danger. As President Lowell has suggested in urging the freshmen dormitories, the recreations of youth lose

[1] *Young Working Girls*, edited by Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913.

their danger when they are associated with one's normal conditions and relationships; they become ominous when they have to be sought apart from the normal way of life. It is precisely so with young people everywhere. Some of the best social service of today is being rendered by residents of settlements, who enter wholeheartedly with young working people into a really vital program of enjoyment within the immediate circle of neighborly acquaintance. These leaders thus acquire an authority from within which enables them, with full and free consent, to establish a better standard, and a still better, for social custom and for personal behavior. To those who know how the fundamental sexual morality of our cities often seems to be trembling in the balance, the value of such a method can hardly be stated in terms too strong or too broad; and it depends upon as close a study, and as persistent and exhaustive a practice, of neighborhood sociology as the most expert local politician can make in his way and for his purpose.[1]

The most significant new phase of the policy of our various semi-public and public institutions for the care of the sick and of the morally delinquent is in their system of so-called social service, or "follow-up" work, through which a patient or inmate is once more, by a marked exercise of persistence and skill on the part of special field officers, integrated into the life of his local community. This means the creation of a network of local influences into which the physical or moral convalescent can be sympathetically received, through which the chance of his again falling out of a normal scheme of life may be greatly lessened.

Such effort adds point, and provides technical stimulus and suggestion, in the neighborhood, toward making such a network effective as a weir in which to catch cases on their way to physical or moral decline; and beyond that toward creating a complete and powerful system of positive upbuilding forces in the neighborhood, affecting every phase of life from infancy onward, which will more

[1] Professor T. N. Carver, of the community organization section of the national Department of Agriculture, says that it is now clear that the economic prosperity of the farmer, instead of making him and his family satisfied to remain upon the farm, only the sooner leads them to move to a town or city. Neighborhood cultural organization in the open country thus appears to be not merely a matter of sentimental interest but of the most substantial national concern.

and more lay aside the merely preventive motive in favor of that which demands the largest and richest fulfilment of life.

It is through the emergence of such interests in their neighborhood phase that a plexus of ties is gradually created which traverses all the cleavages of racial and religious distinction. We need always to remember—and we certainly do not often remember it in the right connection—that in this country we have in an increasingly large proportion of our cities and towns a bewildering complication of all the problems of political and industrial democracy, together with all the problems of cosmopolitanism. Those issues coming out of racial instinct which other nations meet on their frontiers, or at least at arm's length, we find at the very center of our intensest community life. The continual experience of finding that efforts to unite well-meaning citizens upon programs of public welfare and progress are so easily thwarted by the crafty use of racial and religious appeals is only a single index of the absolute patriotic necessity of finding a genuine foundation upon which solid unity of interest and action can be built up. Here the neighbor instinct again demonstrates its priceless value as the cement of twentieth century democracy; but not when left to itself, for here more than ever is necessary the infusion of a type of neighborhood leadership which represents American economic, political, and moral standards. It would be only too easy for the neighbor sentiment to bring about a kind of assimilation among immigrants which would be only a foreign composite, hardly nearer to American standards than were its original constituents.

Under enlightened and patriotic American leadership, every phase of immigrant culture is not only respected but fostered; but the different immigrant types are gradually brought together on the basis of common hygienic, vocational, and recreative interests, through multiplex forms of friendly and helpful association day after day, year after year—until such neighborhood relations begin to constitute in themselves an underlying current of conviction which no ordinary appeal to ancient prejudice can disturb, and upon which the incentives of civic and national patriotism can begin surely to rely.

Such an influence provides for the immigrant that welcome of

which he has dreamed; shelters his children from the vicious allurements against which he often cannot protect them; brings forth for local public appreciation the skill of hand, the heirlooms, the training in native music or drama, which the different types of immigrants have brought with them; makes special efforts to prevent the parents, and particularly the mothers, from falling behind their children in the process of Americanization—thus holding together the fabric of all that is best in the immigrant home, while patiently integrating it into the common local relationships.

Three things may be suggested at this point with regard to the general problem of immigration.

1. All such effort as has been outlined is made extremely difficult and sometimes temporarily impossible by the flooding of neighborhoods with constant new streams of immigrants.

2. The intelligently directed neighborhood process can easily be made the most effective way in which their present and future value to the nation can be determined.

3. Whatever may be said about the restriction of immigration, there is no question but that the one policy after the immigrants have arrived is to train them in our standard of living; and that for this purpose the wisely directed neighborhood process is an absolutely indispensable resource.

Out of such effort today is coming a real emergence of democratic communal capacity. Directly or indirectly as the result of settlement work, there are springing up in the working-class districts of some of our largest cities local improvement societies in which the vital germ of nascent democratic achievement is brought about —a civic result which is worth more, so far as these people are concerned, than would be the universal mastery on their part of all the manuals of constitutional government.

The initial strategy in promoting these organizations is a simple one. It is found that, if no other form of general response can be secured, it is always possible to get people to grumble. They are encouraged to complain about defects in the local municipal service. The complaints are then classified, and those which are most general are made the basis of a common expression. This common expression is then drawn out into some specific piece of common action.

By the time such action has acccomplished the desired result, there has come about a single complete experience and achievement of citizenship which marks the dawning of a downright civic consciousness.

The repetition of such experiences—the discovery that democracy is not merely repressive but constructive in tangible terms; that it properly calls not merely for honesty but for serviceability of administration; that its tangible benefits come equally to all on the same terms—all this constitutes a vital adventure through which a group of neighbors actually taste blood in the matter of citizenship; its sting, its virus becomes a part of their life from that time on.

In political democracy we have a system of co-operation in the great total, which began with the socially microscopic neighborhood unit. The entire succession of utopian social solutions—leaving out of account the last two or three decades when crude conceptions of urban mechanism and flat nationality have dominated them—has always centered in the ideal local community. There is good ground for considering the settlement as being a scientific and more actual project than that of Fourier,[1] for instance, for ultimately, more effectively, and more conclusively accomplishing what Fourier was hitting out at. Certain phases of the organization of labor, the Knights of Labor for example, have undertaken a formation subject to the lines of the local community. Syndicalism today seems to be returning to the same emphasis. It is true, of course, that co-operation in England and on the continent has built largely upon the affiliation of local neighborship, and in turn devotes much attention to cultivating such affiliations. These references are made particularly by way of suggesting that if, as many good observers believe, we are to see in this country a new and rapid growth of experiment toward economic co-operation, these communities in which a vital and achieving neighborhood consciousness has already been aroused will be the most likely soil in which this seed shall germinate and bear fruit. The success of co-operation in England, and its failure thus far here, are commonly laid to the

[1] Brook Farm, in which George William Curtis, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Charles A. Dana, and others were interested, was founded upon the teachings of Fourier.

homogeneity of the one people and the lack of it in the other. The achievement of sound neighborhood assimilation among us will surely go far toward bringing such experiments within our range.

One of the most striking aspects of the presence of mental dark spots with regard to the neighborhood as the least common multiple, from the point of view of the home, and the greatest common divisor, from the point of view of the state, is the almost total lack of the compilation and publication of statistical information about it. Considering the vast effort and expense involved in the collection of statistics covering births, mortality, disease, defectiveness, crime, sanitation, housing, industries, occupation, incomes, nationality, etc., it is really a tragic form of negligence that such facts are not everywhere compiled and graphically set forth so as to point the finger of fate at actual conditions from block to block. As the constructive neighborhood sense grows, it will certainly insist that such precise specifications be laid before it, with the result that the collective power of neighborhoods will be greatly stimulated and developed.

Such a disclosure, minute on the one hand, so far as each neighborhood is concerned, but comprehensive and exhaustive for cities and states, will for the first time present the real pattern in which the municipality and the commonwealth, as total fabrics put together out of interlacing neighborhoods, will begin to work out large human projects in their true lights and shades, and in their delicate adjustments of proportion and perspective. It would be hard to overestimate the importance of such results to city planning. Sociology as an art, no less than as a science, must find its primary essential data in the fully understood neighborhood—building organically from the neighborhood up to the nation. Aside from political action, this same ascendant synthesis must be worked out in terms of voluntary association even more subtly and exhaustively for purposes of advancing social welfare. Here such federations as were first organized in our cities for purposes of scientific charity, and those which with an ampler and more positive program are forming among the settlement houses of some of our cities, are foreshadowing something of the value of the objects, and the interest of the technique, which a properly worked out federation of the

neighborhoods of a city would have. The settlement federations, gathering up in an increasing degree the indigenous interests of the tenement-house neighborhoods of the city, proceed to eliminate wasteful competition of effort, to bring different specialties of service up to the best standard reached by any of the houses, to secure experts in different forms of service and send them from neighborhood to neighborhood, to classify local needs that are common to all the neighborhoods and make them the basis of a presentation of ascertained facts to be acted upon by the city government or the state legislature, and to bring out into the broader life of the city the average citizens of the less resourceful local sections.

In one city there is a United Improvement Association with delegates from some eighteen local improvement organizations, including both the downtown and the suburban sections. This organization is gradually coming to have much of the influence of a branch of the city government, with the important qualification that membership in it is by definition restricted to men who have won their right to membership in it by neighborhood social service. The sociological type of federation goes experimentally through the actual hierarchy of the social organism, from the family, through the neighborhood, the larger district, up to the city and the state —it rediscovers what precise functions belong to each in and of itself, what functions the neighborhoods perform for the city through acting by themselves, and what functions they can render for it as for themselves only by broad forms of thoroughly organized team play covering the city or state as a whole.

There are two of our great institutions which, roused by the results of experiment in neighborhood reorganization, are beginning to awaken to the great national possibilities of a quickened neighborhood spirit, freshened down to date. The public school in some of our states is being developed into a rendezvous for every form of local community interest; and a specialized force is beginning to be organized for the necessary and responsible leadership in such enterprise. The church social service commissions, which have now been organized in not fewer than thirty-five different divisions of the Christian church—though somewhat inclined to issue judgments upon broad economic problems which had better be left to

experts in such matters—are coming to realize that the churches possess an inconceivably valuable asset for social reconstruction in that they have in every local community throughout the land a building equipment and a group of people who, as a matter of fact, are already solemnly pledged to work with everyone in the community for the well-being and progress of the community as a whole. The spread of the conception—and it is spreading rapidly—that the local church exists not for itself but for its community—that the minister must find in his congregation not his field but his force—that the best and strongest people in each local congregation must be sent freely out into the open community there to work out vows of service in full co-operation with persons coming from other congregations and with men of good will apart from any church connection—will give a new complexion to many of the most anxious problems of social democracy.

DISCUSSION

[On account of a failure of the stenographer to write up notes taken at this and following sessions, the discussions are only partially represented in this volume. No report could be obtained of the debate upon Dr. Wood's paper.]

INFORMAL CONFERENCE

JOHN M. GILLETTE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

The topic of discussion of this afternoon's informal conference is "What are the best contributions sociologists can make at the present toward the improvement of the conditions of life in the United States, particularly the central portion of the country?"

Since this society is holding its annual session at a point the farthest west in its history, particular reference to the Mississippi Valley is not inappropriate. It is also proper because of the unique position this section holds relative to the nation as a whole. The Mississippi Valley contains the bulk of the population of the nation, approximately 65 per cent of the inhabitants of continental United States. The population of this region is probably more homogeneous than that of any other great region, unless it is the Pacific Coast region. The larger part of the agricultural resources of the nation are to be found here. It is also to be observed that the public-school system in the form of high schools and state universities has attained its highest and widest development in the Mississippi Valley. Because of the homogeneity of population, interests, and institutions that is to be found in the region between the Appalachian and Rocky mountains, it may be conceived that the problems confronting the various communities of this region possess a large degree of similarity and that whatever tasks sociologists of those communities are called on to do to promote their interests will have much in common.

When I face the question as to what sociologists may do to further the interests and life of their respective communities I am reminded of a saying of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter pertinent to the situation in Europe following Napoleon's aggressions. It was to this effect: To France has been given the land, to England the sea, and to Germany the air. There are those who think that sociologists hold a position relative to the world's affairs somewhat similar to that Richter assigned to the Germans. However, it may turn out that as Germany has constructed a very real empire on the basis of her intellectual supremacy, sociology may ultimately prove to be the richest contributing factor to the world's progress.

No doubt community usefulness on the part of sociologists is dependent on the temper of individuals and on the conditions which are peculiar to given regions. But there are some things which are possible to nearly all communities. It is my function to mention and sketch briefly only a few things in which the work of the sociologist may count.

First, I think it may be safely posited that the sociologist is to find his greatest contribution in the direction of the social good in the nature and quality of classroom instruction. It has been my experience that sociology occupies

a peculiarly useful position in the college curriculum. The academic life of the liberal-arts student formerly was rounded off by a course in philosophy. This procedure has fallen into the background in the larger institutions. But some such course is useful, for it gives the student a concatenated view of the universe and of life. In one sense sociology very fitly fills this need. It is a unifying study and draws the conditions with which most are familiar into a relationship with each other so that the world is no longer fragmentary and without perspective. An able student, after going through Ward's *Pure Sociology* with me, said: "This is the best course I ever had. It has gathered together all the things I had previously learned and made them mean something to me." Again, the subject of sociology is fruitful in the life of the student because it is constructively ethical and progressive in the habit of mind and spirit of interpretation it establishes. The series of popular articles of a few years ago that pictured our reputable sociologists as engaged in "blasting at the rock of ages" was not without grounds. The habit of the majority of people is to take everything for granted as having existed always and to believe that so it will always continue to exist, giving it its face value. Things and institutions are good because they are as they are. Every kind of man who rises to the heights is good and deserving because he has arrived. A better social cosmos is not anticipated because the element of control of the stream of civilization is not suspected. If it is not the purpose of sociology to remove this superficial and easy-going social complaisancy, fortunately it is one of its results. Sociology, by accounting for the appearance of, and changes in, institutions of all sorts, habituates the student to the attitude of expecting transformation and of seeing in it, under intelligent guidance, a means of realizing a better state of man. And by systematically insisting that all institutions and organizations are to be regarded as means rather than as ends in themselves, as agencies through which human welfare is to be secured, and that their measure and test consist in their service and promotion of the common good, sociology gives the student an intensely vital and ethical outlook on human affairs and places in his intellectual mechanism a method of interpreting life which works in the direction of better things. In short, the great personal function of sociology is the building of ethically progressive citizens.

Just recently a civil engineer called on me. He is a graduate of my institution. In his course he had strayed over and taken a course in sociology. After serving the railways and the government in Canada a year and a half he was full of impressions. In the course of the conversation he said: "The work I did in sociology was better than any other six courses I had in the university. It opened my eyes to see things and gave me the means of interpreting and valuing them." Such opinions have come to me so often that I am obliged to assign to them some importance as an index where sociology may find one of its greatest functions.

Second, it is becoming apparent that the sociologist may exercise a function in the community and the state. This is especially true of the sociologist

who deals with the applied phases of the subject. By means of investigative work, the making of surveys and community studies, and the publication of the material, not only is the public at large put in possession of information bearing on social conditions generally, but the immediate community is put in the way of new accomplishments. I have found that it is not a difficult matter to turn the results of investigative work toward practical legislative ends. It is always quite possible to get in touch with members of a legislature or council, secure interest in the proposed legislation, and sometimes get enactments for remedying evils or for creating new agencies. Legislators are really eager, for personal reasons sometimes, or for the love of a cause, to espouse a measure. I am certain that sociologists and social scientists generally could have a very much larger influence than they do have if they would cultivate the acquaintance and interest of legislators and other governmental officials.

Third, I may only mention the importance of getting in touch with the welfare work of the local community. Associated charities and juvenile probation and court work exist in all the larger communities. In the smaller cities, especially, there is a dearth of directive ability, making the assistance of one trained in the theory of relief work a very welcome and valuable asset. Besides this, much good work can be done by the preparation of welfare exhibits and their exhibition in neighboring communities. It may prove feasible to organize civic institutes where some systematic instruction pertaining to community betterment may be given a community. The welfare exhibit can be used to good purpose in such an enterprise.

J. T. HOUSE, NORMAL SCHOOL, WAYNE, NEBRASKA

The chief value derived from the teaching of sociology is the effect upon the attitude of the student toward life. The object of instruction in this subject in the secondary schools would be to multiply this result. The question is, then, not one of desirability but of practicability. Many indications point to the possibility of the rapid extension of the work of sociology to lower grades.

First, there is great dissatisfaction among teachers and thinking people with the results of present work in secondary schools, especially in the matter of ethical training. This makes an open door for sociology. If it is to be the synthesizing science and the inclusive system of ethics, now is the time for its healing and unifying work to begin all down the line in the schools.

Second, the secondary schools are more and more the institutions of liberal instruction while the university begins the work of specialization nearer and nearer to the beginning of its course. It is amazing how positive of his life-philosophy and life-purpose a college Freshman who has chosen his specialty may be. While he is in the secondary school, the mind of the youth is still open to suggestion from many sources. If his imagination and thought are to be captured for this wider and better view of life and its meaning it must

be accomplished during these earlier days of his academic career. The passion for service, the reverence for values, the determination to do the most and best with his days on this planet, must be aroused and guided before he goes to the university.

The subject is not too difficult for the student in the secondary school. We find that the learning process is at its best at twenty-one and that often the youth is developing his whole system of thinking at seventeen. It is not so much a question of age as of individuals. Some learn early and well and others never learn at all in sociology as in other sciences.

Where shall we get the teachers? I note that young men from the universities, some of them with the doctorate, are engaging in the teaching of sociology at a salary of from $1,000 to $1,500. Now, most normal schools and many high schools pay more than this. Doubtless teachers will be found. But the specific thing that would add to the supply is to make sociology a required subject for the graduates of the departments of education in all our universities. The close relation between sociology and pedagogy is coming to be recognized. The fellowship should become yet closer.

EDWARD C. HAYES, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

There are at least four ways in which the sociologist can serve the community: by his teaching, by his writing, by lecturing and other forms of public address, and by participation as a more or less leaderly citizen in public activities. Other speakers will undoubtedly emphasize the latter forms of service, and that which I say will have reference to the first, viz., the opportunity to serve the public in the teaching of sociology.

Our teaching is often divided into two parts which are referred to as the Practical and the Theoretical; and what I have to say refers to the teaching of theoretical sociology. For probably the most practical part of sociology is the theoretical, and the greatest public service which we can render is to furnish a philosophy of life.

By a philosophy of life I do not mean a detailed program of social action nor an itemized creed, but rather certain fundamental concepts in the light of which our policies will be shaped and from which motives will be derived. The study of sociology should enable those who sit in our classes to see themselves as products and as factors in a causal process in which the values of life for individuals and for society are realized or destroyed.

Few things are more tragic than the loss by an individual of his life philosophy—a loss which has been experienced in our day by many individuals. To such an individual the meaning of life fades, even the difference between black and white is obscured—nothing seems worth heroic struggle, and motive is dissipated—so that he stands like a mill upon the bank of a stream that has run dry, and there is no power to turn the wheels.

Societies, as well as individuals, may lose their philosophy of life, and American society may at present be divided into three parts: first, those who

are clinging with a relaxing grasp to conceptions which gave nobility to earlier generations; second, those who have adopted a materialistic and individualistic philosophy of life, which may develop motive and power, but the direction of the power is in part destructive, and that philosophy can never realize the fullest worth of life, nor the possibilities of society; third are those who have begun to apprehend the constructive life philosophy upon which the future must be built.

The past has drawn its philosophy of life from the unknown. The future will draw its philosophy of life mainly from the known facts of life itself.

I have no sympathy with the atheism which was expressed by Professor Ward. Negative dogmatism concerning the unknown is as truly dogmatism as any positive dogmatism can be. I prefer such agnosticism as that of Herbert Spencer, who, while acknowledging that we cannot define that which lies beyond the range of our observation and inference, yet affirms that nothing is more certain than that we are in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed. We may go farther with Ratzenhofer, who says that man has five fundamental interests and needs: first, the need of material sustenance; second, the interest which perpetuates the species; third, the urge to make the most of himself and his own importance; fourth, the social interest which recognizes the reality and worth of the experiences of his fellow-men and impels him to promote their welfare; and fifth, the transcendental interest, the conscious need of relationship with the great totality. To this last I would add the saying of Jesus: Inasmuch as we have done it to the least of these, our brethren, we have established our relation with the Infinite. As the cog fits the gear, and the gear fits the shaft, and the shaft joins the wheel, and the wheel is belted to the turbine, and the turbine is plunged in the river of power which moves the whole, so we establish our relationship with the totality in proportion as we fulfil those relations with our associates which come within the range of our intelligence.

It is sociology that is in position adequately to show that an independent human life is an utter impossibility; that but for the inheritance of the products of social evolution, the most gifted man would be a naked savage and a dumb brute; that it is impossible to live a civilized life for a single day without accepting the fruits of the labor and the suffering, the life and the death, of thousands of our fellow-men; that the gifts which we receive are incalculably in excess of any that we can return; that all civilized life is a co-operative enterprise; and that the fulfilment of its possibilities waits until men apprehend this fact, and each conducts his common labors not merely for what he can get but as a participation in a common task.

As the physical sciences one by one have passed over from the realm of metaphysical speculation to the realm of objective facts, so now the science of ethics, except in so far as it is a mere history of former conceptions, must make the same transition and take its place among the studies of objective reality. Good and evil, ruin and fulfilment, are as real as crops of grain or thickets of

weeds and come about by as orderly a process of causation, and in proportion as we know these facts, we have the guidance and the motives for the conduct of life. The prime need of any society is a dominant conception which gives direction and power to activity. The true conception for this purpose is to be had in proportion as we comprehend the nature and interrelationship of the facts of life, and the conception thus derived will not lose but gain in power with the increase of our knowledge.

C. C. North, De Pauw University

I believe that the best contributions that sociologists can make will always be the results that they may leave on their students through teaching. In my somewhat limited experience as a teacher, students in my classes fall into about four groups. The first group is made up of those who come into some course in the department without any very clear purpose. They need the credit or want "something" in this department, or a number of their friends are taking it. The second group is made up of those who have some definite objective. They are preparing for teaching, or for law, or for the ministry, or for business, or for journalism. They come into the department because they want something that will help them in preparing for their particular career. In the third group are those who are intending to enter social work and want a theoretical foundation and some instruction in the practical social problems that they will confront in a professional way. Then, finally, there are a few rare individuals, keen of mind and deeply interested in the subject because they have discovered that they want to go on for graduate work with the expectation of becoming professional sociologists.

Now, even with the first group there is considerable opportunity. They may be given a "look in" at least on the meaning of social relations and stimulated to some thinking along lines that will make them more thoughtful citizens.

With the second group there is large opportunity. It is here, I think, that the chief work is to be done. These students are to furnish the leadership in many communities. It is upon them that the responsibility for the social life of many individuals will rest. If we can give them the social point of view and an understanding of the principles of social progress and social improvement we shall do much. Particularly in the Middle West is there an appalling lack of appreciation of the dynamic aspect of society. The average Middle West citizen is still doubtful about the need for, and the possibility of, change in many of our social institutions. The leadership of this part of the country must come from those who are trained in the social science departments of the colleges. Sociology can do much here.

The third and fourth groups are necessarily small. There will be a constant temptation to give chief attention to these specialists. I believe thoroughly that we must be on the lookout for such individuals and by encouragement and special direction guide into these highly specialized fields those who

show special aptitude. But to make the department of sociology primarily a means of developing this kind of student seems to me to be losing our chief opportunity. As for the practical work a sociologist can do in direct relation to the social problems of the community, I do not feel that it will ordinarily be large. If any great amount of time or energy is taken, it must come from that which would otherwise be given to the students. Of course, if the college can release the teacher a part of his time from teaching, well and good. But speaking merely from my own limited experience in trying to do such work, I should say that for the ordinary teacher of sociology, work outside his college must be limited.

This is not to say that a teacher is not a citizen of the community. He must of course play his part as a member of that community. But for leadership in the improvement of the social conditions of his community, his time and energy will generally be very limited.

H. A. Miller, Olivet College

All of us can tell of the great influence that our teaching has had on our students. They tell us how sociology has turned the world over for them, but we have got to make sociology respected by scholars, which is not the case now. Sociology ought to supplant psychology as the basic study of pedagogy. Psychology deals with method while sociology deals with purpose, the one looks backward and the other forward, and if there is any single requirement for education it is that of preparing for the future. If sociology cannot command respect in any other way, it should "butt in" and offer its services. Sociologists ought to be leading speakers at state teachers' associations but they are rarely called upon. They should be called into the counsel of state educational systems as other experts are called in from various departments, and outline the aims of education in fitting children for citizenship in the society in which they are going to live. Sociology cannot adequately make its contribution to society merely by influencing students; it should exercise its prerogative in guiding the thinking of society toward a fulfilment of its possibilities.

Paul L. Vogt, Miami University

Two contributions toward improvement of conditions should be emphasized. First, the development of the social consciousness in the college student, the future community leader. Young people come to college primarily because they think the college training will give them added prestige or will increase their earning capacity. If the student does not think in these terms his parents think thus for him. This self-advancement ideal must be worked over until the student can realize that he is a part of a group and can think more in terms of what he can do to advance the common good. If the ideal of service is definitely planted, the college graduate will do his part in finding ways of

expressing that ideal, in business, in the professions, or in whatever activity he finds his life's work.

Second, the sociologist should assist in the work of social reconstruction through scientific analysis of existing conditions in his social environment. The survey is the necessary prerequisite to constructive social advance, and the sociologist should not only assist in the preliminary work of analyzing conditions but should be ready to contribute principles of social control that will aid in the solution of the problems presenting themselves not only in the local community but also in the state.

THE ASSIMILATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

FAYETTE AVERY McKENZIE
Ohio State University

To the descriptive scientist who paints his way through the series of race conflicts—through the history-long tragedy of the contacts of conqueror and conquered—there comes a certain artistic glow as he contemplates the relations of the white man and the red man in the United States. If such a scientist were here he might delude his academic soul into the belief or hope that learned phrase and happy illustration would lull him today into the elysium of gentle but pleasing uselessness. But such is not the desire or intent of the writer of this paper. The topic in his mind is concrete and involves action. It is summed up in two phrases: (1) the obligation of the nation to the Indian, and (2) the obligation of the universities in general, and of the sociologists in particular, to furnish the scientific basis for the Indian policies of the nation.

The first thesis scarcely needs comment; we have forced upon the Indians the status of wards, and therefore cannot divest ourselves of the responsibilities which devolve upon trustees and guardians. The second thesis must remain in abeyance until we have assurance that there are sociological principles which are applicable and of imperative importance. This paper therefore rests upon the first thesis of national obligation as one conceded, and leads to the second thesis of university obligation as a corollary of the general contents of the paper itself. But it cannot be understood except in relation to these two dominant ideas.

My topic really is the topic of the Indian problem of today. As a nation we are at least ostensibly engaged in the process of assimilating the Indian. This is fundamentally a sociological problem, but what interest have the sociologists taken in it? It may be that limited knowledge or permanent introspection has given me a false notion, but you will allow me to say that my voice seems to me like the voice of one crying in the wilderness, with

almost no response from the ranks of those who should long ago have done the great work which would have made my humble endeavors unnecessary.

I want if I can to sum up a situation, and to place upon my hearers something of the great sense of responsibility and duty which has been with me almost constantly for the last ten years. Perhaps any one of you could have solved the problem alone in that space of time, but I warn you that my weakness or little success will be no excuse for your inaction in the future. I trust that the imperative in my tone may not seem offensive. No one more than I realizes the killing pace that is set for the sociologist. But he that hath eyes let him see, and he that hath ears let him hear. The possibility of salvation for the Indian races lies in the hands of those who have vision and hearing. If there be any imperative resting upon the sociologist it will not be because I presume to pronounce it, but because he both sees and hears and is a sociologist.

In passing let me say my views are largely wrought out of my own experience. My theory has been hammered out on the slow anvil of some actual endeavor and of some direct association with the people I would serve. Incidentally it might not be amiss to suggest that one of the great reasons for direct service on our part in the social movements of the world is that we may rectify, if not actually create, the splendid body of theory which we are to transmit to our students. It is very questionable whether theory unfertilized by endeavor remains good theory. It takes years of patience before you can begin to know an Indian and therefore before you can begin to get first-hand knowledge of the human unit of your problem.

A well-worn formula tells us that when two races come together the fate of the weaker is summed up as extermination, subordination, or amalgamation. As a matter of fact history would suggest a judicious mixture of all three. Nevertheless a fourth object has been evident on the part of the conquering Caucasian from the days of the first discovery of America. Missionary objects have ever been to the front. The missionary believes in assimilation—either in time or in eternity. But the efforts of the missionaries for three hundred years—shall I say four hundred years?—have

seemed to be the efforts of those who write upon the sands of the shore of the sea. The disappearance of the tribes from the days of Eliot in Massachusetts to those of Zeisberger in Ohio has constituted a tragedy which has almost no acknowledged explanation. The optimism of Eliot shines today against a background of almost complete failure, so far as bringing his Indians into the permanent life of the United States is concerned. Zeisberger's personal experience sums up the point I wish to make. On Christmas Day, 1788, he wrote in his diary: "The chief thing which gives us joy and courage is this, that the Gospel . . . . is not preached in vain. . . . . It opens the hearts and ears of the dead and blind heathen and brings them life and feeling." His biographer tells us, however, in the end that Zeisberger's life "seems a sad one. It was his fate to labor among a hopeless race. In his last years he could see no lasting monument of his long labor. Even the Indian converts immediately about him were a cause of sorrow to him." Zeisberger's permanent Indian villages in Ohio have long been forgotten. From the point of view of incorporation into the life of the nation Zeisberger's efforts must be acknowledged a failure.

We have no time at this point to state or to discuss the reasons for this fact; we do not affirm or deny that the fault lay with the missionary. It is sufficient to say that, in accordance with the general rule, despite the white men's religion, the red men died away in the presence of the white man's civilization. And yet we may say that gradually or rapidly policies of extermination and subjugation overrode the efforts of religion. Missionary endeavor did not have a free field to prove itself. The soldier and the merchant rode with the missionary and made themselves not less evident to the Indians than did he.

The ever-growing friction between the races reached its climax in the middle of the nineteenth century. The cost in money and lives was enormous. Down to 1866 our government had spent half a billion of dollars on Indian wars. We killed off Indians at a cost of a million dollars apiece. The relative futility of war strengthened the hands of the believers in assimilation as opposed to extermination, and so we have in Grant's administration the beginning of the "peace policy."

The first Board of Indian Commissioners intrusted with the inauguration of this new policy struck the first clear note of governmental philosophy which we find. Their altruistic devotion and their business capacity have long been recognized. Their scientific insight, however, will constitute their greatest claim to a place in history, when history is correctly written. They believed that assimilation was possible, but that it would come about only through the living together of the two races. The initial step in the upward movement lay in the bestowal of a common language. Education then was the keynote, and today it remains the keynote of any scientific policy. The salvation of the race and the efficiency of any Indian policy are equally dependent upon it. Doubtless the board relied a little too strongly upon the power of language, but yet it remains substantially true that difference in language bars intercourse and mutual understanding, and so preserves both the differences in customs and the artificial antipathies which hold the races apart.

The "peace policy" in most of its practical details was built up out of many bits of endeavor made during colonial and later days, and it was defended and utilized for very utilitarian objects. The Secretary of the Interior on this latter point filed his belief that it would be "cheaper to feed every adult Indian now living —even to sleepy surfeiting—than it would be to carry on a general Indian war for a single year." Thus as a matter of fact a policy of stimulation has all too frequently become a policy of pauperization. Assimilation has been replaced or supplemented by slow extermination. Peace became an object in itself rather than the instrument of progress.

Francis Walker in 1874 declared that the "peace policy," at least in its actual working, was not a policy, but a mere expediency. No great constructive advance had been made. He maintained, on the contrary, that the act of 1834 which provided for segregation of Indians and for Indian self-government was the outcome of a "sound and far-reaching statesmanship." The "peace policy" as supplemented by the congressional resolution ending the recognition of Indian tribes as nations "struck the severest blow that remained to be given to the policy of 1834, in that it weakened the

already waning power of the chiefs, while yet failing to furnish any substitute for their authority."

Possibly we may say today that the two great results that accrued from the "peace policy" were the ending of Indian wars and the new impetus given to Indian education. The next period began about 1887. Not until 1876 had the appropriation for education reached $20,000, but in 1886 it passed one million. In 1887 the Dawes Act marked the new era in its provisions for bringing about individual allotments of Indian land and for the admission of Indian allottees into citizenship. Along with these movements there came a demand for the "vanishing policy," a phrase which was intended to mean that discriminations and privileges peculiar to the Indian should as rapidly as possible be done away, and he should at the same rate be admitted to full citizenship and equal opportunity to share in the economic, legal, and political life of the country. Carried to its logical limits the "vanishing policy" goes a long ways along the path of assimilation.

Today with the churches increasingly active, with the government appropriation for education running close to $4,000,000, with individualized holdings of land, and with citizenship an accompaniment of such holdings, you will tell me that assimilation is surely provided for, if not already achieved. I recite these things, however, that you may discriminate between the form and substance of things.

Consider with me, if you will, three groups of facts, those of blood mixture, of legal status, and of education. We shall then have a suggestion, if not a measurement, of the extent to which assimilation has gone.

With regard to blood we shall follow the facts as analyzed by Roland B. Dixon, of the Census Bureau. Since 1890 the Indian population has increased from 248,000 to 265,000, or about 7 per cent. Of the present population Dr. Dixon reports 58.4 per cent as full-bloods and 35.2 per cent as mixed bloods, 8.4 per cent being unknown as to blood. Doubtless the mixed bloods are more numerous than they will acknowledge, but in any event we may say they constitute at least two-fifths of the total Indian population. Moreover, mixed marriages are more often fertile, result in a larger

number of children per family, and a larger proportion of these children survive. Dr. Dixon believes that "unless the tendencies now at work undergo a decided change the full-bloods are destined to form a decreasing proportion of the total Indian population and ultimately to disappear altogether."

It is probably safe to say that so far as the blood of the race is to survive it will survive through amalgamation. But amalgamation is not assimilation. An Indian in the eyes of the law continues to be an Indian until the proportion of Indian blood is very slight indeed, and his own insistence upon his Indian blood continues still longer. From the social point of view the mixture of bloods has little significance. The blood that determines the legal status and social environment is the blood that tells. Ofttimes the mixed blood is farther from, not nearer to, social assimilation than is the full-blood. Even the adopted white man is cut off from white civilization to a greater or less extent. Law and custom are stronger than blood. Complexion, real or imputed, is for the Indian a barrier which he scarcely may surmount so long as law and custom remain unchanged. But when law and custom are satisfactorily changed, the fact of physical amalgamation will greatly accelerate the process of real assimilation.

The legal and political status of the Indian is particularly unfortunate. Tens of thousands of Indians have been allotted. Most, but not all, of these are nominally citizens. Custom and congressional action have given citizenship to tens of thousands of others. For purposes of congressional representation 73 per cent of all our Indians are accredited as "taxed" Indians. In all the United States there are only 71,872 not so taxed. This certainly looks like rapid if not complete assimilation. But I beg you to look again past the form to the substance. Let me quote my own analysis of the situation as given in the *Journal of Race Development* a year ago:

> There is no necessary connection between taxation and citizenship. The Indian may swell the population for the congressional district, he may be counted a taxable, and yet be substantially and, apparently, legally, debarred from citizenship. No one knows today what the status of the Indian is.

Even such facts as we do know present such a diversity of situation in the different states that no general statement can be made for like classes in different parts of the country. But this might be condoned if the status of the Indian in each state was understood either by him or by the general public. Doubtless even congressional enumeration as "taxed" carries an Indian (if only he knows he is one of the number so classed) far along the road to citizenship; he becomes relatively at least a "potential" citizen. . . . .

So long, however, as we have taxed Indians and non-taxed Indians, citizen Indians and non-citizen Indians, independent Indians and Indian wards, and so long as we have every sort of combination of these classes, and further, so long as we have neither certainty as to classification nor definiteness as to the status when named, just so long we shall continue to have a condition of confusion in Indian affairs intolerable alike to government and Indian. Indians of like capability and situation are citizens in Oklahoma and non-citizens in New York. Allottees are citizens in Nebraska and non-citizens in Wyoming. In many cases in the same state some of the allottees are citizens while others are not.

I know an Indian admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of the United States who was compelled to appear before an agent for examination as to his competence to manage his own property. That agent later went to the penitentiary for graft. Do you wonder that the Indians resent the impossible situation and the perpetual humiliation in which they are involved? Do you call this assimilation?

The situation with regard to education is very similar. The expenditures for Indian schools as compared with the general Indian budget has increased from one-half of 1 per cent in 1877 to 26.9 per cent. I believe that this proportion should continue to increase. Of the 88,000 Indian youth, 50,000 or 56.3 per cent are today found in some school. Of the children between ten and fourteen years of age, 71.4 per cent are in school; 71.2 per cent of all Indians can speak some English, and 45.4 per cent can read and write to some extent. The ability of the youth to speak English rises to 84.2 per cent and ability to read and write rises to 77.2 per cent.

I consider it a great achievement to have effected so complete an introduction to the educational system of our civilization. But we must in all honesty recognize that it is for the great mass of

Indians merely an introduction. An Indian attorney, now well known and prosperous, last year in a public address in Columbus gave us a most interesting bit of personal experience when he told us what an amazing impression he had of the English language and of our civilization after years of attendance upon our government schools. It is our rule to require the youth to go to school until they are eighteen, and not infrequently they continue in school until they are twenty-five or more, and yet the most advanced government school is a grammar school. The great mass of the children get very much less. No attempt is here made to appraise the industrial training given in the Indian schools. My object is simply to reveal the inadequacy of the schooling to prepare the Indian for successful competition in the world of business affairs and for a genuine participation in the thought and aspirations of our civilization. Is it any wonder we are afraid to trust an Indian with full control of his land and property?

Let us stop a moment and summarize. The Indian race is fast reducing the purity of its blood, but the Indian blood predominates and holds the succeeding generations out of the national thought and out of Caucasian social control. No one is free until he shares in the thought which controls his social life. The mixed blood in custom and tradition is Indian, or raceless, which is worse. The Indian has no defined status. Taxed, he may or may not be a citizen. If taxed, or even if a citizen, he may have few or none of the privileges and immunities of a citizen; he may not—ordinarily he does not—have the control of his own property. If he is not a citizen, he is incompetent to sue or be sued, and is not even a competent witness in court. Even whole tribes of Indians, every individual of which may be nominally a citizen, have no standing in court, and have no right to sue for their claims, even in the United States Court of Claims. And in the third place, though we spend on an average about $100 per year on every Indian child in the government schools, and demand from them not less than twelve years, and sometimes hold them far beyond their majority, yet the limited few who get an advanced education do not by government policy go beyond the eighth grade of our public schools.

Now may I state my thesis? The Indians are *not* assimilated. The assimilation of one race into another and surrounding race means bringing them into a full share in the life and thought of the latter. They must become constituent parts of the nation. They must be units of the new society. John S. Mackenzie, in his *Introduction to Social Philosophy*, has stated the point I wish to make in these words:

> When a people is conquered and subject to another, it ceases to be a society, except in so far as it retains a spiritual life of its own apart from that of its conquerors. Yet it does not become an integral part of the victorious people's life until it is able to appropriate to itself the spirit of that life. So long as the citizens of the conquered state are merely in the condition of atoms externally fitted into a system to which they do not naturally belong, they cannot be regarded as parts of the society at all. They are slaves: they are instruments of a civilization of which they do not partake. Certainly no more melancholy fate can befall a nation than that it should be subjected to another whose life is not large enough to absorb its own. But such a subjection cannot be regarded as a form of social growth. It is only one of those catastrophes by which a society may be destroyed. In so far as there is growth in such a case, it is still a growth from within. The conquering society must be able to extend its own life outward, so as gradually to absorb the conquered one into itself; otherwise the latter cannot be regarded as forming a real part of it at all, but at most as an instrument of its life, like cattle and trees.

I maintain that the Indian has not been incorporated into our national life, and cannot be until we radically change a number of fundamental things. We must give him a defined status, early citizenship and control of his property, adequate education, efficient government and schools, broad and deep religious training, and genuine social recognition. We must give him full rights in our society and demand from him complete responsibility. There is not time today to put these principles into a concrete program. The important thing is to recognize and publish the principles.

The Indians today, the great mass of them, are still a broken and beaten people, scattered and isolated, cowed and disheartened, confined and restricted, pauperized and tending to degeneracy. They are a people without a country, strangers at home, and with no place to which to flee. I know that there are thousands of exceptions to these statements, but yet they remain true for the

great majority. The greatest injustice we do them is to consider them inferior and incapable. The greatest barrier to their restoration to normality and efficiency lies in their passivity and discouragement. We have broken the spring of hope and ambition. Can it ever be repaired?

It is readily to be seen that success will depend upon the accurate utilization or release both of external forces and of internal forces. The white race through government, industry, and religion must do its full part, and the red race through initiative and race leadership must also do its full part. I cannot make too clear, definite, or positive my belief that this problem is an exceedingly delicate one, and my belief that *failure is inevitable unless just the right policies are initiated very soon and carried on and carried through on the basis of maximum efficiency.*

The simple test of efficiency for us is, are we giving the Indian identical or equal opportunity with ourselves to share in and to control the social consciousness, as well as to share in the privileges, immunities, duties, and obligations of the members of our national social body? This is the only goal worth while in assimilation. I grant you that public opinion is very far from this point of view and belief. The question for us is, do sociologists agree with it?

How shall Congress and the nation believe except they be taught? And who shall teach except those who have set themselves apart to study these things? If the body of sociologists could agree upon the theory and would express themselves individually and collectively, they could exert an immense influence at this particular critical moment. The hour is ripe and conditions are propitious for a considerable forward step—if only those who can speak with authority will speak. They must secure a consistent governmental practice, and guide public policy through the formulation of sound theory and the organization of a wise public opinion.

Long ago I became convinced that the Indian problem could not be solved without the initiative and co-operation of the Indian himself. When the government has done all that it can, there still remains the stimulation and development of internal forces to be effected. Race leadership must be found or the race will fail to see the new and better opportunities and will sink to rapid ruin.

It used to be said that it would be impossible for Indians to organize and to hold together. Personal jealousies would wreck every endeavor. But the impossible has been done. For three years in succession the Indians have met in national conference, twice at the Ohio State University, and this year in the city of Denver. The conference has grown to a membership of nearly a thousand people, half of them Indians, half of them whites. Indians only are active members and do all the voting. They are publishing a remarkable quarterly journal, and if properly supported bid fair to do a work of great significance. Their Denver platform is of a quality which will compel national attention. Out of great sacrifice and labor this new force emerges. Shall we not welcome it and give it every possible support?

For us, duties divide into those imperative for the moment and those which relate to the future. We have our obligations toward pending legislation and in the support of the splendid efforts of the society of American Indians.

For the future we must set ourselves the task of continuous education of the public that every correct endeavor shall be protected and aided to the point where it achieves its proper and logical results. All of us can share in this task. But should not some of our great universities go farther? Ought there not to be one or more endowments created to establish chairs of race development with particular reference to the native race of the American continent? We have eminent professors who as anthropologists, ethnologists, and historians study the Indian of the past. Should we not have men who can devote themselves to the problem of the Indian as he now is, and to the problem of the means by which he may realize his highest possibilities as a citizen and fellow-worker? Such studies should mean vast things, not only for the United States, but for the uncounted millions of native Americans in the countries to the south of us. The nation and the continent call for this great new chair in sociology. Do we not owe this to the people we have so largely dispossessed?

I close with an appeal for your help in the cause of the Indian. However great or small you may think that help will be, it may be the force which will determine whether the scales shall turn in the

direction of wisdom or unwisdom, of salvation or ruin, for the race that once ruled the domain from whence comes the wealth and resources with which we build, through our universities, the civilization of the future. With you rests the decision.

BRIEF LIST OF REFERENCES AND SOURCES

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Barrows, W. *The Indian's Side of the Indian Question.* Lothrop & Co., 1887.

Ellis, G. E. *Red Man and White Man in North America.* Little Brown & Co., 1882.

Grinnell, George Bird. *The Indians of Today.* Duffield & Co., 1911.

Harrison, J. B. *Latest Studies on Indian Reservations.* Indian Rights Association, 1887.

Humphrey, S. K. *The Indian Dispossessed.* Little Brown & Co., 1905.

James, James Alton. *English Institutions and the American Indian.* Johns Hopkins Press, 1894.

Leupp, Francis E. *The Indian and His Problem.* Scribner, 1910.

Manypenny, G. W. *Our Indian Wards.* 1880.

Pancoast, Henry S. *Indian before the Law.* Indian Rights Association, 1884.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Report of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt Made to the U.S. Civil Service Commission upon a Visit to Certain Indian Reservations and Indian Schools in South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas.* Indian Rights Association, 1893.

Walker, Francis A. *The Indian Question.* Osgood & Co.

Weil, Robert. *Legal Status of the Indian.* New York, 1888.

REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Annual *Reports* of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; the Board of Indian Commissioners; the Mohawk Conference of Friends of the Indian and other Dependent Peoples.

Kappler, C. J., Ed. *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties.* 2 vols. Senate Doc., 58th Cong., 2d sess., No. 319, 1904.

Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians (Washington).

Reports of the Indian Rights Association (Philadelphia); the National Indian Association (New York).

THE RISING NATIONAL INDIVIDUALISM

HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER
Olivet College

It is not at all clear just where the individual merges into the social, but we have become familiar with the contrast between Individualism and Socialism, and everyone has a fairly good idea of what is meant by the two terms. We are beginning to see that men are more closely related to the groups to which they belong—family, community, and religious organization—than to any interest which could be more specifically called merely personal. The object of this paper is to show that there is a rapidly developing individualism that is distinctly social, and which promises to become a powerful factor in human affairs. The earlier conflict between Socialism and Individualism is likely to be diverted to that between Socialism and Nationalism or the struggle for national individuality.

At the present moment the world is organizing itself into two great camps—Socialism and Nationalism. Both are expressions of the group feeling; both are movements of revolt; both are struggles for freedom. They started from a common impulse about fifty years ago, but quickly found themselves arrayed against each other. One would break down political boundaries; the other would build them up. Socialism calls all the world one; Nationalism sets part against the rest. Socialism is economic; Nationalism sentimental. Both are rapidly becoming world-wide and must fundamentally modify statecraft.

Socialism is one of the world-movements accepted as an actuality. It has a program which seeks more or less clearly defined results. But National Individualism looms on the horizon as an equally extensive expression of human association which cannot fail to be a temporary check to the realization of the ideal of the socialist.

It has sprung into being in its present form so rapidly that it has been difficult to recognize it as one of the most potent forms

of social consciousness. It is akin to patriotism as generally understood, but draws its lines according to the group consciousness for a common language, common traditions, or a feeling of the unity of blood through some common ancestor. It does not correspond to present national boundaries, but rather to historic or even imaginary boundaries. At the present time this sentimental Nationalism is fraught with more significance on the continent of Europe than existing political divisions.

In the United States with its hordes of various peoples such as no other country ever knew, an understanding of the national feeling is indispensable before we can hope to assimilate our aliens into Americans.

Just as Socialism has been a revolt against the coercive control of men by wealth or arbitrary government, so this national feeling is the revolt of a people conscious of its unity against control by a power trying to annihilate this consciousness. The phenomenal development of both Socialism and Nationalism has been in the last decade.

Labor has been oppressed since war first made slaves, and nations have been oppressed since war first made some groups conquerors and others subjects, and until recent times no one thought any other condition possible. The discovery that these conditions are not inherent in the structure of the universe resulted in Socialism for the individual and Nationalism for the group.

The policy of Europe has been the control of various areas and peoples by a few great powers. Of late years this control has been maintained by relatively much less war than formerly. Thus the German Empire was consolidated rather peaceably. Austria has established and maintained its domination over its heterogeneous aggregation of Germans, Poles, Bohemians, Slovaks, Slovenes, Croations, Bosnians, Dalmatians, and Italians. Russia has increased its control over Finland and Poland. Italy has become strong through the union of small kingdoms. But there was never a time when there was so little assimilation as at present. Bavaria and Saxony love Prussia no better than before they became integral parts of the German Empire. It seems inevitable that the time is not far distant when disintegration and realignments will change

the map of Europe. They are likely to be made peaceably—that is, if the psychologically inevitable is accepted, and the indications are so clear that he who runs may read, even if he be the Czar of all the Russias.

Austria is more nearly like the United States in the complexity of her problem, and sends us samples of all her own troubles. If we take one of her provinces, Bohemia, we may observe one of the ways in which the national movement is expressing itself.

The Bohemians are members of the great Slavic division of the human race. For many centuries the country has been part of Austria. In 1415 John Hus, a Bohemian Protestant leader, a century before Luther, was burned at the stake. From that date he has been the symbol of the Bohemian spirit, and at the five-hundredth anniversary of his death, in 1915, will be held the greatest celebration ever seen in Bohemia. Bohemians in America have been planning for years to return for it. This is very significant in light of the fact that after the Thirty Years' War, which began in 1620, Protestants were exterminated from Bohemia, and for more than a hundred and fifty years everyone within the borders of Austria except Jews had to be Catholic, and at the present time nearly all of them are officially members of that church. The language became officially and practically German. Bohemian, in fact, was hardly known except in the remote districts.

The present situation was brought out in an address given by Count Lützow in Prague in 1911, when he said:

> One of the most interesting facts that in Bohemia and especially in Prague mark the period of peace at the beginning of the nineteenth century is the *revival* of the *National feeling* and *language*. . . . . The greatest part of Bohemia formerly almost Germanized has now again become thoroughly Slavic. The national language, for a time used almost only by the peasantry in outlying districts, is now freely and generally used by the educated classes in most parts of the country. Prague itself, that had for a time acquired almost the appearance of a German town, has now a thoroughly Slavic character. The national literature also, which had almost ceased to exist, is in a very flourishing state, particularly since the foundation of a national university. At no period have so many and so valuable books been written in the Bohemian language.

Count Lützow himself had an English mother and a German father, but has identified himself completely with the Bohemian

nationalism. The Countess is the daughter of a German minister in Mecklenberg, but feels so strongly against the Germans, that, not knowing the Bohemian language, she speaks only English and French.

About fifty years ago several Bohemian writers were bold enough to write in their own language instead of in German, and from that time the Bohemian spirit has grown until now hostility to German has become a passion. In many of the restaurants throughout Bohemia, the headwaiter or proprietor passes a collection box regularly for "the mother of schools" which supports public schools in the Bohemian language in all parts of the country where there is a majority of Germans. In the case of a German majority the community provides only German schools.

The inevitable result of this universal spirit is the gradual elimination of the German language. One rarely hears German on the streets of Prague, whereas ten years ago one heard little else. Fathers were reared to speak German but teach their children Bohemian instead. Business men take great pride in the fact that they are succeeding without knowing any German, for it proves that Bohemian is winning. A German cannot get served in a Bohemian restaurant in Prague unless he speak Bohemian, though the waiters know both languages. All older people speak both languages equally well, but the younger very little German. At the University of Prague, where until 1882 all the work was in German, now the graduates do not know German well, and the Bohemian part of the university is more than twice as large as the German. The nationalizing process of unifying the people is going on in face of the disrupting force of eleven political parties, besides the sharp spiritual division into Catholics and anti-Catholics.

It is unquestionably a disadvantage for a people of seven million to cut itself off from the opportunities of the environing German culture, science, and commerce, but even those who see it best deliberately assume the cost in their struggle for the freedom of the spirit. When we remember that the prestige is on the side of the German, we see in this movement the same indifference to personal success that characterizes the socialist.

Socialism is strong in Bohemia. The party has nineteen news-

papers including three dailies; 1,500 locals with 130,000 members; and at the last election 400,000 votes were cast. But they were Socialists in part as a revolt against the government and the church. When they get to America most of them do not remain with the party. In Bohemia and in some other countries there are already two Socialist parties, Nationalists and Internationalists, with the Nationalists increasing the more rapidly.

The most striking form of national spirit in America is expressed by the Bohemians in their organized propaganda for free thought. Ninety-seven per cent of the Bohemians are nominal Catholics on their arrival, but at least two-thirds of those in America are militant freethinkers. Their attitude toward religion, especially toward the Catholic church, is similar to that of the Socialists, but this makes no bond of union between them. Bohemian freethinking is a story in itself, and it obviously is too general to have a real philosophical basis in the minds of a large portion of its adherents. It is rather an expression of the historical hatred for Catholic Austria, just as Polish Catholicism is an opposition to orthodox Russia and Protestant Russia, and Irish Catholicism to Protestant England. As the sight of a Russian church makes a Pole pious, so the sight of any church makes a Bohemian a freethinker. In the city of Chicago there are more than twenty-seven thousand people who make quarterly payments for the support of schools on Saturday and Sunday to teach the Bohemian language and free thought.

Not only is Nationalism a controlling force in the social institutions of our immigrants in America, but they all have organizations for the raising of money to promote the cause in the mother-countries.

A more comprehensive and fundamental expression of this movement than has been described is the rapidly developing pan-Slavic feeling. In 1912 there was an international Slavic gymnastic meet in Prague. More than twenty thousand persons took part, and at one time eleven thousand men speaking several different languages including the soon-to-be enemies, Bulgarians and Servians, were doing calisthenics exercises together. With the exception of the Poles, who would not come because the Russians were invited, there were representatives from all the Slavic divisions: Slovaks,

Slovenes, Serbs, Servians, Croatians, Bulgarians, Montenegrins, Ruthenians, Moravians, Bohemians, and Russians. The keynote of every speech was "Slavie! Slavie!" and when it was uttered the crowds would go wild.

There were a quarter of a million visitors in the city and illustrated reports of the exhibition went to the ends of the Slavic world. A few weeks afterward I saw some of them pasted on the wall of a peasant's factory in the back districts of Moscow. But the German papers completely ignored the whole thing, and no self-respecting German could attend the meet. The streets were everywhere decorated with flags, but never did one see the Austrian flag. People of conservative judgment stated that the meet indicated a great growth of pan-Slavic feeling as compared with five years before.

At the outbreak of the recent hostilities in the Balkan States it was feared that there might be a general European war, but especially between Austria and Russia, and Austria and Servia. The latter seemed very imminent at one time. We were given to understand that the modern high level of diplomacy held the war off. It was generally admitted that the great Socialist meeting in Switzerland, held to protest against making the workingmen of one country fight the workingmen of other countries, was influential in preventing hostilities.

There was interesting news that was not being published from Vienna which also had an influence. It did not seem possible that Austria with two-thirds of its population Slavic could make war on Servia. Inquiry disclosed that when the Bohemians were being entrained from their garrisons for mobilization on the Servian border, they sang the pan-Slavic hymn, "Hej Slovene!" sung by all the Slavic nations, but forbidden to be sung by Austrian soldiers in service. This is an enthusiastic and powerful hymn full of encouragement to the Slavs, telling them that their language shall never perish, nor shall they, "even though the number of Germans equal the number of souls in hell." There is not a shadow of a doubt that if Austria had forced these men to go against Servia at that time, Austria would have been disrupted. More than

70,000 Austrian Slavs disappeared when they were called for their military service.

The diplomats knew this feeling and now the German Empire is struggling under an unparalleled war tax which the chancellor openly stated was being raised from fear of what might happen as the result of this rapidly growing pan-Slavic feeling. Pan-Germanism is growing to keep pace with its antagonists. The military future of Europe must reckon with all this, just as it must reckon with the international brotherhood idea of Socialism. When a war does come which raises a conflict between these motives, we may expect that the emotion of Nationalism will overthrow the rationality of Socialism. In other words, there is a definite obstacle to Socialism which cannot be put aside until the spirit of national individuality shall have had an opportunity to free itself from the coercion which has attempted to crush it. The time cannot be far off when the rulers of the world will realize that the way to vitalize it is to try to kill it. When the group no longer feels any restraint on itself as a group, then the free development of the idea of brotherhood stands a good chance of encircling the earth; but in the meantime, the human soul in its common life will fight to extinction to be assured of its own common identity.

Julius Lippert, quoted in the *American Journal of Sociology*, September, 1913, said:

> All the experiences which I gathered in my most diversified political activities tended to confirm my conviction that the first and indispensable precondition of the material and spiritual prosperity of two national stocks, located in the same country under such circumstances as those which existed in Bohemia, must be a fixed legal norm for their status, and their freedom of movement. How strict or liberal should be the terms of this law is a matter of secondary importance. Whenever we Germans have neglected to secure such a norm we have committed a political blunder injurious to both parties. It is no longer practical politics to demand the subordination of one of the national groups to the other.

Socialism is horizontal, aiming to unite all those of common economic interests in the common cause, that none may have unfair advantage over another. Nationalism, on the other hand, is perpendicular; forgetting class lines, it makes common cause of the symbols of unity, whether they be blood, language, or tradition.

It is an evidence of the subtle fact that one's individualism is not revealed in an isolated being, and that the nearest and dearest thing to the heart of man is the social group in which he identifies his spiritual reality. And since one's personality is more the work of the group than of himself, the loyalty which expresses itself in national feeling is a more powerful control than Socialism. As was stated above, Socialism is economic, Nationalism sentimental. The central philosophical principle of Socialism is economic determinism which Nationalism sets at naught by flying into the face of economic advantage. Both movements are conspicuously unselfish, and the devotion to them is distinctly religious in its character. Both thrive within the same people, but sooner or later come into conflict. Both thrive best where there is the most opposition to them. In America neither has been comparable to the European developments. Nationalism persists among our immigrants until they discover that we make no effort to curb it, and dies in the third generation. The widespread growth of Nationalism is illustrated further in the following:

Poland was never particularly conspicuous in art, literature, or government, but something over a hundred years ago it was a free country. Now, Germany, Austria, and Russia have divided it, and, completely ignoring sociological laws, are trying to absorb it. Never was there such another deliberate attempt on a large scale to wipe out national individuality, but if there was ever a case of imperial indigestion, Poland is causing three chronic attacks. Bismarck's policy of forbidding the Polish language, and forcing German in its place; and Russia's similar policy with Russian have made the preservation of the language a religion, and martyrdom for it a glorification. At the present time there is little doubt that Poland is best organized for the propaganda of Nationalism. Socialism has considerable strength, and in Warsaw where a Socialist paper may not be published, they are smuggled from Cracow regularly. The strong hold of the Catholic church upon the Poles makes it hard for Socialism to gain headway, and greatly complicates the situation. The Poles think that their love for the church is piety. They are really good Catholics because their religion is Poland, and Catholicism is a Polish protest against orthodox Russia

and Protestant Prussia. I was interested in observing, when walking with a Polish gentleman, whose education is such that he would have been a weak Catholic in any other country, that after passing a Russian church his zeal in crossing himself at the next Catholic church would be increased. Every sign of Russia or Germany says to the Pole, "Be a devout Catholic." In fact, any particular religious form is never so strong as the spirit of Nationalism to which it may often serve merely as a symbol. As one listens to the bated breath and sees the uplifted eye of the Pole when the ancient kingdom of Poland is mentioned, one needs no interpreter to tell where the heart is. The obsession of the Poles is to find ingenious methods for thwarting the plans of the various controlling governments. Progress as a plan has no interest. Their backward look becomes more intense every day, so that psychologically with them, if not temporarily, the day of ultimate international social co-operation is farther off the nearer we come to it.

In the midst of Poland is the Lithuanian movement. Several centuries ago a prince and princess of these two countries married, and the government and culture became Polish. There was no Lithuanian literature or education. The language was preserved by the peasants as was the case among the Finns, Hungarians, and many other peoples. Poles and Germans were the landholders, and the Lithuanians almost altogether laborers or serfs. Within the last decade the Lithuanian consciousness has burst into a conflagration. A man fully Polish in culture and associations, but possessing some Lithuanian blood, will become Lithuanian in spirit. He is learning the language from the peasants, and chooses them for associates rather than the cultured Pole with whom he associated ten years ago. After the revolution of 1905 the privilege was granted the students in the *gymnasia* to adopt the Russian, Polish, or Lithuanian language for part of their instruction, where previously only Russian had been allowed. In a *gymnasium* in Vilna, where there had been in one class thirty who had spoken Polish, only three chose Lithuanian. Now out of the same number at least twenty will take Lithuanian, and the change is an indication of the growth of the movement throughout the people. I have had two students who speak Polish as a mother-tongue, and Lithu-

anian with relative difficulty. One is half Polish in blood, and has learned to read Lithuanian since coming to America. When in the *gymnasium* in 1905 he chose Polish as his language, but his younger brother now in the *gymnasium* speaks nothing but Lithuanian when possible, though his mother does not know the language, and his father very slightly. A still older brother, a successful attorney in St. Petersburg, is now studying the language and feels fully Lithuanian. One of the students, when he came to America three years ago, allied himself with Lithuanians, although there are practically none of his class here and the Poles would have welcomed him gladly. Although an aristocrat in training, he feels closer to the Lithuanian peasant than to the Pole of his own social position with whom he has associated all his life. We see in this case—that of my other student is similar—that national consciousness has broken down class lines exactly as Socialism seeks to do, but entirely within the nation, and thus raises a barrier to one of the main purposes of Socialism. The wall is thus raised between people of the same class across the borders.

Finland is similar to Lithuania in being subject to a subject people of Russia. For six and a half centuries the Finns were ruled by Sweden, but in 1890 the country became subject to Russia, since which time the efforts at Russification have been continuous. The population is approximately 85 per cent Finnish, 12 per cent Swedish, 3 per cent Russian. The culture has been continuously Swedish. At the University of Helsingfors, where twenty-five years ago all the work was done in Swedish, now the larger portion is in Finnish, and the Finnish spirit is increasing by leaps and bounds. Seven and a half centuries of Swedish culture with no Finnish education has had no effect except to stimulate the growth of Finnish national feeling. The two peoples live amicably together. The Swedes and a few Russians conduct most of the business and have the social standing. Both Finns and Swedes are Lutheran, the services in the official church alternating between the two languages. Finland is very democratic—equal suffrage has prevailed for several years. Socialism has been very strong among them. In Chicago they have the largest proportional membership in the party of any foreigners. But in Finland the Socialist vote is beginning to

diminish, apparently because this other struggle for freedom cannot be attained through Socialism. The children in the schools must study Swedish, Finnish, and Russian. The government is increasingly Russian, but there are absolutely no signs of assimilation. Helsingfors and other Finnish cities look more like Detroit and Washington than like St. Petersburg, though Russia has been working a full century on them.

As has been suggested, both Lithuanian and Finn are revolting against the culture authority of Pole and Swede rather than the political or economic authority of Russia. This is because in both cases the nationalizing people feel that their individuality is more endangered by the spiritual than by the material power. A union between the working classes of Poles and Lithuanians, Finns and Swedes must overcome a much greater resistance today than would have been necessary ten years ago. In Chicago the Lithuanian Nationalists and Socialists are divided into two nearly equal camps, and practically all the people belong to one or the other. Nationalists regularly resist Americanization. They do not want their young men to go to American colleges lest they come under too much American influence.

Sweden and Norway have already made a new alignment. Here were two countries with similar people, language, tradition, and geography, but Norway felt a restraint on her individuality, and in 1905, there was peaceable disunion. In America one can hardly commit a more serious offense than to confuse a Swede and a Norwegian. These two countries are very democratic and both cast a large Socialist vote, but a Swede is a Swede, and a Norwegian is a Norwegian before he is class-conscious across the border. The Norwegians have revived and modified the language which was spoken by the people before Norway was conquered by the Danes, and in the coming year a formal popular movement is to be launched to make it the language of the people instead of the one which has been used for centuries. In America the Scandinavians have made no effort until recently to teach their children the language of the fatherland. Now many schools have been established for teaching the language, and in Sweden, as in Bohemia, many towns have museums with collections representing the peculiar local history;

and costumes that had yielded to the common European dress are now being worn on gala occasions.

Human nature is the same in all peoples. It is, nevertheless, a remarkable fact that this movement should occur so contemporaneously among such diverse peoples in such various degrees of civilization, but it is unquestionably a world-movement. Japan, India, and Egypt are teeming with it. Korea, after being satisfied with Chinese literature for centuries, now that Japan is exercising authority over her is religiously developing her own language and literature. In Hungary, Slovak hates Magyar, and both hate the Germans. In France, where Syndicalism, the most unpatriotic and radical form of class-consciousness, calls for class war, in the last three or four years the spirit of Nationalism has risen to a level never before realized in its history.

In any particular nation there seem to be peculiar reasons justifying and promoting its development, but they are the occasion rather than the cause. There can be nothing mystical about it, but the rapidity of communication must have enabled a suggestion to find ready fields. Thus Ireland in the fifties was a stimulus to Bohemia, though the history of Bohemia seems to contain quite enough stimulus of its own.

Ireland has been the best-known expression of Nationalism because of the recurrence and continuance of the home rule discussion. The present conflict between the home-rulers and the people of Ulster who are opposing them is due to the fact that the question is nationalistic rather than geographical. The Scotch-Irish of the north are not only Protestants, but feel their relationship to England, and home rule for Ireland will mean foreign rule for them. For all the noise of their struggle, the Irish have made far less success than many of the others, for Gaelic has succumbed to English.

As we become more familiar with the soul of our newer immigrants we shall hear stories about home rule that will make the activities of the Irish seem relatively unimportant.

Canada is coming into a national feeling. The reciprocity treaty with the United States was rejected as soon as the import of Champ Clark's annexation speech was understood, and the

government of Canada was forced into a complete change, while Canada's self-consciousness has increased beyond all expectation.

Every sane person realizes that interference with the affairs of Mexico would arouse a Nationalism which would make ineffective any ideas we might try to impose upon the country. Domination by superior force is no longer accepted as a matter of course, and this is a new fact in the world's development.

From these examples of intense feeling it becomes clear why representatives of the subject-nations of Austria should visit the director of census, and Congress, to demand that they be counted by mother-tongue rather than by country of birth. There is far less community of feeling between Bohemian, Magyar, and German in Austria, than between England, France, and Germany, and from the point of view of assimilation in this country, the latter group might much better be grouped as one than the former.

Whether Nationalism be rational or irrational, it is a fact. The political science of the nations of the earth must be revised in the face of it, and in America our practical treatment of our alien peoples needs to take cognizance of the fact that human nature expresses itself more strongly in the struggle for sentiment than in the struggle for bread. But when full freedom for the development of group-consciousness shall have been attained, the fearsome elements of the antithetical movements of Socialism, Syndicalism, and Anarchy will have disappeared.

In America the popular idea prevails that it is our business to assimilate our aliens by making them over according to some fixed standard. The only true prophet seems to be crass Americanism. This is a pathetic and impractical mistake. The nationalities have as definite cultures as individuals. Why should our Bohemian children be made into Americans by singing "Land where our Fathers died," when their fathers died in just as noble a fight for freedom in the Hussite wars? At least they ought also to sing their own national song. Our problem is to make our immigrants co-operating members of our civilization, and we cannot do this by repressing the peculiar social impulses each group brings with it. Probably there is no other nationality in which the common use of the language persists so long as with the Bohemians.

Often the third generation use nothing else in the family circle. Since so many of them have passed beyond any religious influence, I think there can be no better method of moral control and assimilation into American life, than offering the Bohemian language in the elementary schools. They would thus develop a respect for their language and a respect for the ideals which have actuated their national heroes. We need have no fear that they will not learn English. Our problem is not at present at all parallel to that of Europe. With us Nationalism is an emotional force that can be used to control the second generation, whereas if we attempt to suppress it we shall be laying up for ourselves increasing trouble.

DISCUSSION

ROBERT E. PARK, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The paper just read (Mr. Miller's) among other things seems to emphasize the fact that sentiment is still a force in the affairs of the world. I do not think that anyone can study the history of the nationalistic movement in Europe without coming to understand that self-respect, for example, is just as vital an interest, just as important to the progress and welfare of peoples, as meat and drink or any other practical and material motives.

To the cosmopolitan spectator who views the scene from the outside, the struggle of these little racial groups to maintain each its own miserable existence seems not only futile and irrational, but like a revolt against manifest destiny.

It is hard for us to see what sense there is in the attempts that are now being made to revive forgotten forms of speech and raise a barbarous dialect to the dignity of a literary language. Particularly is this true as the effect and aim of these revivals seem to be to shut up the sources of learning and culture to peoples to whom they were previously open.

I think, however, that a closer study of these movements will reveal in every case that, behind all that seems wild and irrational in these movements, there are motives and interests which are at least intelligible. To begin with, I believe that in every instance it will be found that these movements have grown out of the efforts of a depressed or subjugated people to regain their lost prestige or to maintain their self-respect in the presence of hostile criticism, discrimination, and prejudice.

I want to emphasize particularly this, namely, that while these nationalistic movements in their actual manifestation are more or less irrational, the expression of blind impulses, rather than the fulfilments of rational interests, they are none the less vital to the people engaged in them. They are, in fact, for the particular people concerned, a matter of life and death. I do not

believe, in short, that it is possible for a subject people to rise in the face of prejudice, discrimination, and a hostile public opinion, except through the medium of forces and sentiments which are produced in just this sort of a struggle, of latent energies released in the creation of this type of social group.

I might add that, if there is anything in just what I have said, it seems to open a whole new field for investigation and study, and one that is clearly not within the range of economics nor possible of description and explanation in economic concepts.

JOHN M. GILLETTE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

I do not pretend to be an expert on Indian matters, but some familiarity with Indian conditions arising from visitation on several reservations and from special investigations of primitive secret societies made in the field among the Dakotas has given me an interest and a slight insight into some phases of Indian life. It is a rather amazing fact that men who represent scientific and historical bodies in the study of our Indians so infrequently manifest any interest in their welfare. For them the Indian is a being who is to serve as a scientific curio and an object of investigation. The popular estimate of the Indian is that he is an utterly worthless being and that any method of quick extermination that is not too brutal may very well be adopted. If this estimate is questioned, one is met by a superior smile and the remark, "I guess you do not know the Indian." The case of the "relapsed" Indian is cited as ample proof that the Indian is a completely inferior creature in every way. It is assumed that he represents all Indians and that he demonstrates that the culture of civilization cannot be assimilated and that what does get lodged is not permanent. Yet in reality a relapse on the part of a primitive man who has been educated in an institution outside of his group and sent back to the latter to live is exactly what a sociologically trained person would expect. For nothing is better attested than the mastering power exercised upon the individual by the downpull of a surrounding group whose culture is of a more backward type. Our frontiersmen who hailed from the East were strongly influenced by the customs of the Indians with whom they came in contact. Even within our own society a person educated away from home who settles down in a home community that represents a lower grade of culture gradually responds to the influence of the more backward ideals and standards. Reformed convicts who are thrown among old criminal associates soon return to their anti-social activities.

What I have said is appropriate to the discussion of the assimilation of the Indian. It is suitable to suggest the background for the conduct of the social agency which is bound to have the largest part in his assimilation. The hope of the assimilation of the Indian, culturally, is dependent on the slow method of inculcating into his mind our civilization by means of infra-group and local methods of education. The method of education which we have used

upon the Indian has not been suitable to accomplish its purpose because it has been in terms of the white man's standards and environment. It has not been put into the terms of the Indian's group-life and needs, and consequently has stood outside his real life. So long as we take the young away from their homes and infect them with an educational skin disease we are living in the educational dark ages. But if schools were established in their midst, adjusted to what they know, made responsive to their tribal standards, articulated with their family and vocational activities, and supported by teachers and helpers who would minister in the direction of building up ideals and practices in domestic and agricultural work, I have little doubt that they would respond by moving in the direction of our civilization with surprising vigor. But this is too little done in our own "civilized" school system. Perhaps the millennium will have come or the Indians have disappeared by way of physical assimilation ere we are ready to apply it to our wards.

H. A. MILLER, OLIVET COLLEGE

The practical application of this study is that we must deal with our various immigrants by understanding their point of view and their prejudices. Thus in dealing with the Bohemians it must be remembered that they have a decided antipathy for the church. When Wayman was seeking a political office in Illinois he spoke before a Bohemian organization and said that there are three important institutions, the home, the church, and the state. One of the Bohemian daily papers devoted its space to making fun of the speech suggesting that a man was a fool to think that the church was an important institution.

When President Taft was seeking the second nomination he accepted the invitation of a Bohemian Catholic society to speak in their hall. If he had known as much as I do about the Bohemians, he would have known that that was an unwise political act, for the majority of the people are Freethinkers. He won the Catholics but aroused the enmity of the Freethinking majority and lost many votes. A couple of years ago I was invited by a Bohemian Protestant to speak on Comenius, the famous Bohemian educator. The meeting was held in a Presbyterian church. Although I knew the editors of the Freethinking and Socialist papers personally, they would not mention the lecture in their papers because it was in a church. When I was asked to repeat it in a public-school auditorium both papers announced it, and the audience was at least twice as large.

With such an attitude on the part of a group it is no wonder that Sunday-school people discover that Bohemian children must be dealt with by more rational methods than other nationalities, and it is a waste of energy to send the ordinary missionaries among them.

The Scandinavians have their group experiences also. In a normal school not a thousand miles from here the Norwegians were given charge of the

assembly exercises on May 15, the national holiday. One of the Norwegian teachers was attached to an American girl who, with one other, refused to stand when the Norwegian national hymn was sung, saying in justification that "they ought to give up those things and be Americans." The Norwegian was greatly hurt by this feeling, and expressed almost a loathing for the country and a decided change of feeling for the girl. Nationalism among the Scandinavians in America is expressing itself by a great increase in the attention to teaching the language to the children. A few years ago there was not any interest in it, and now it is very common.

F. A. McKenzie, Ohio State University

I am glad that President Small called attention to the fact that there were other university men besides myself interested in Indian affairs. It is true, but we will all agree that there is no large number of such men who are concerning themselves about the pressing problems affecting the existence and welfare of the Indian at the present time and for the future. If anyone could clearly show that the sociologists of the country were in positive agreement upon any or all of the points of my morning thesis, it would be a factor of power in the determination of the national attitude and the national policy. We ought individually, if not collectively, to make our position clear. I should appreciate it if the sociologists would honor me by giving me their opinions on these points. . . . . I agree with the suggestion from the floor that the missionaries should do more, and that they should help the Indians, not only by preaching, but by bringing the Indians into a fuller share in the whole range of our industrial and social life. . . . . The query that pleases me most this morning is "What can we do?" I reply by saying that there are pamphlets on the table in the rear of the room which answer that query. You can urge Congress to a famable consideration of pending Indian legislation, and you can support the higher aims of the Society of American Indians by associating yourself with that organization and by standing firmly for those principles which are essential if the native race is to survive and really live.

RACIAL ASSIMILATION IN SECONDARY GROUPS[1]
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE NEGRO

ROBERT E. PARK
University of Chicago

I

The race problem has sometimes been described as a problem in assimilation. It is not always clear, however, what assimilation means. Historically the word has had two distinct significations. According to earlier usage it meant "to compare" or "to make like." According to later usage it signifies "to take up and incorporate."

There is a process that goes on in society by which individuals spontaneously acquire one another's language, characteristic attitudes, habits, and modes of behavior. There is also a process by which individuals and groups of individuals are taken over and incorporated into larger groups. Both processes have been concerned in the formation of modern nationalities. The modern Italian, Frenchman, and German is a composite of the broken fragments of several different racial groups. Interbreeding has broken up the ancient stocks, and interaction and imitation have created new national types which exhibit definite uniformities in language, manners, and formal behavior.

It has sometimes been assumed that the creation of a national type is the specific function of assimilation and that national solidarity is based upon national homogeneity and "like-mindedness." The extent and importance of the kind of homogeneity that individuals of the same nationality exhibit have been greatly exaggerated. Neither interbreeding nor interaction has created, in what the French term "nationals," a more than superficial likeness or like-mindedness. Racial differences have, to be sure, disappeared or been obscured, but individual differences remain. Individual differences, again, have been intensified by education,

[1] The distinction between primary and secondary groups used in this paper is that made by Charles H. Cooley.

personal competition, and the division of labor, until individual members of cosmopolitan groups probably represent greater variations in disposition, temperament, and mental capacity than those which distinguished the more homogeneous races and peoples of an earlier civilization.[1]

What then, precisely, is the nature of the homogeneity which characterizes cosmopolitan groups?

The growth of modern states exhibits the progressive merging of smaller, mutually exclusive, into larger and more inclusive social groups. This result has been achieved in various ways, but it has usually been followed, or accompanied, by a more or less complete adoption, by the members of the smaller groups, of the language, technique, and mores of the larger and more inclusive ones. The immigrant readily takes over the language, manners, the social ritual, and outward forms of his adopted country. In America it has become proverbial that a Pole, Lithuanian, or Norwegian cannot be distinguished, in the second generation, from an American born of native parents.

There is no reason to assume that this assimilation of alien groups to native standards has modified to any great extent fundamental racial characteristics. It has, however, erased the external signs which formerly distinguished the members of one race from those of another.

On the other hand, the breaking up of the isolation of smaller groups has had the effect of emancipating the individual man, giving him room and freedom for the expansion and development of his individual aptitudes.

What one actually finds in cosmopolitan groups, then, is a superficial uniformity, a homogeneity in manners and fashion, associated with relatively profound differences in individual opinions, sentiments, and beliefs. This is just the reverse of what one meets among primitive peoples, where diversity in external forms, as between different groups, is accompanied with a monotonous sameness in the mental attitudes of individuals. There is a striking similarity in the sentiments and mental attitudes of peasant peoples in all parts of the world, although the external differences

[1] F. Boas, *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, quoted by W. I. Thomas, in *Source Book for Social Origins*, p. 155.

are often great. In the Black Forest, in Baden, Germany, almost every valley shows a different style of costume, a different type of architecture, although in each separate valley every house is like every other and the costume, as well as the religion, is for every member of each separate community absolutely after the same pattern. On the other hand, a German, Russian, or Negro peasant of the southern states, different as each is in some respects, are all very much alike in certain habitual attitudes and sentiments.

What, then, is the rôle of homogeneity and like-mindedness, such as we find them to be, in cosmopolitan states?

So far as it makes each individual look like every other—no matter how different under the skin—homogeneity mobilizes the individual man. It removes the social taboo, permits the individual to move into strange groups, and thus facilitates new and adventurous contacts. In obliterating the external signs, which in secondary groups seem to be the sole basis of caste and class distinctions, it realizes, for the individual, the principle of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-aller*. Its ultimate economic effect is to substitute personal for racial competition, and to give free play to forces that tend to relegate every individual, irrespective of race or status, to the position he or she is best fitted to fill.

As a matter of fact, the ease and rapidity with which aliens, under existing conditions in the United States, have been able to assimilate themselves to the customs and manners of American life have enabled this country to swallow and digest every sort of normal human difference, except the purely external ones, like the color of the skin.

It is probably true, also, that like-mindedness of the kind that expresses itself in national types, contributes, indirectly, by facilitating the intermingling of the different elements of the population, to the national solidarity. This is due to the fact that the solidarity of modern states depends less on the homogeneity of population than, as James Bryce has suggested, upon the thoroughgoing mixture of heterogeneous elements.[1] Like-mindedness, so far

[1] "Racial differences and animosities, which have played a large part in threatening the unity of States, are usually dangerous when unfriendly races occupy different parts of the country. If they live intermixed, in tolerably equal numbers, and if in

as that term signifies a standard grade of intelligence, contributes little or nothing to national solidarity. Likeness is, after all, a purely formal concept which of itself cannot hold anything together.

In the last analysis social solidarity is based on sentiment and habit. It is the sentiment of loyalty and the habit of what Sumner calls "concurrent action," that gives substance and insures unity to the state, as to every other type of social group. This sentiment of loyalty has its basis in a *modus vivendi*, a working relation and mutual understanding, of the members of the group. Social institutions are not founded in similarities any more than they are founded in differences, but in relations, and in the mutual interdependence of parts. When these relations have the sanction of custom and are fixed in individual habit, so that the activities of the group are running smoothly, personal attitudes and sentiments, which are the only forms in which individual minds collide and clash with one another, easily accommodate themselves to the existing situation.

It may, perhaps, be said that loyalty itself is a form of like-mindedness, or that it is dependent in some way upon the like-mindedness of the individuals whom it binds together. This, however, cannot be true, for there is no greater loyalty than that which binds the dog to his master, and this is a sentiment which that faithful animal usually extends to other members of the household to which he belongs. A dog without a master is a dangerous animal, but the dog that has been domesticated is a member of society. He is not, of course, a citizen, although he is not entirely without rights. But he has got into some sort of practical working relations with the group to which he belongs.

It is this practical working arrangement, into which individuals with widely different mental capacities enter as co-ordinate parts, that gives the corporate character to social groups and insures their solidarity.

addition they are not of different religions, and speak the same tongue, the antagonism will disappear in a generation or two and especially by intermarriage. . . . . But in one set of cases no fusion is possible; and this set of cases forms the despair of statesmen. It presents a problem which no constitution can solve. It is the juxtaposition on the same soil of races of different color."—James Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, pp. 245–46.

It is the process of assimilation by which groups of individuals, originally indifferent or perhaps hostile, achieve this corporate character, rather than the process by which they acquire a formal like-mindedness, with which this paper is mainly concerned.

The difficulty with the conception of assimilation which one ordinarily meets in discussions of the race problem, is that it is based on observations confined to individualistic groups where the characteristic relations are indirect and secondary. It takes no account of the kind of assimilation that takes place in primary groups where relations are direct and personal—in the tribe, for example, and in the family.

Thus Charles Francis Adams, referring to the race problem in an address at Richmond, Va., in November, 1908, said:

> The American system, as we know, was founded on the assumed basis of a common humanity, that is, absence of absolutely fundamental racial characteristics was accepted as an established truth. Those of all races were welcomed to our shores. They came, aliens; they and their descendants would become citizens first, natives afterward. It was a process first of assimilation and then of absorption. On this all depended. There could be no permanent divisional lines. That theory is now plainly broken down. We are confronted by the obvious fact, as undeniable as it is hard, that the African will only partially assimilate and that he cannot be absorbed. He remains an alien element in the body politic. A foreign substance, he can neither be assimilated nor thrown out.

More recently an editorial in the *Outlook*, discussing the Japanese situation in California, made this statement:

> The hundred millions of people now inhabiting the United States must be a united people, not merely a collection of groups of different peoples, different in racial cultures and ideals, agreeing to live together in peace and amity. These hundred millions must have common ideals, common aims, a common custom, a common culture, a common language, and common characteristics if the nation is to endure.[1]

All this is quite true and interesting, but it does not clearly recognize the fact that the chief obstacle to the assimilation of the Negro and the Oriental are not mental but physical traits. It is not because the Negro and the Japanese are so differently constituted that they do not assimilate. If they were given an oppor-

[1] *Outlook*, August 2, 1913.

tunity the Japanese are quite as capable as the Italians, the Armenians, or the Slavs of acquiring our culture, and sharing our national ideals. The trouble is not with the Japanese mind but with the Japanese skin. The Jap is not the right color.

The fact that the Japanese bears in his features a distinctive racial hallmark, that he wears, so to speak, a racial uniform, classifies him. He cannot become a mere individual, indistinguishable in the cosmopolitan mass of the population, as is true, for example, of the Irish and, to a lesser extent, of some of the other immigrant races. The Japanese, like the Negro, is condemned to remain among us an abstraction, a symbol, and a symbol not merely of his own race, but of the Orient and of that vague, ill-defined menace we sometimes refer to as the "yellow peril." This not only determines, to a very large extent, the attitude of the white world toward the yellow man, but it determines the attitude of the yellow man toward the white. It puts between the races the invisible but very real gulf of self-consciousness.

There is another consideration. Peoples we know intimately we respect and esteem. In our casual contact with aliens, however, it is the offensive rather than the pleasing traits that impress us. These impressions accumulate and reinforce natural prejudices. Where races are distinguished by certain external marks these furnish a permanent physical substratum upon which and around which the irritations and animosities, incidental to all human intercourse, tend to accumulate and so gain strength and volume.

II

Assimilation, as the word is here used, brings with it a certain borrowed significance which it carried over from physiology where it is employed to describe the process of nutrition. By a process of nutrition, somewhat similar to the physiological one, we may conceive alien peoples to be incorporated with, and made part of, the community or state. Ordinarily assimilation goes on silently and unconsciously, and only forces itself into popular conscience when there is some interruption or disturbance of the process.

At the outset it may be said, then, that assimilation rarely becomes a problem except in secondary groups. Admission to the

primary group, that is to say, the group in which relationships are direct and personal, as, for example, in the family and in the tribe, makes assimilation comparatively easy, and almost inevitable.

The most striking illustration of this is the fact of domestic slavery. Slavery has been, historically, the usual method by which peoples have been incorporated into alien groups. When a member of an alien race is adopted into the family as a servant, or as a slave, and particularly when that status is made hereditary, as it was in the case of the Negro after his importation to America, assimilation followed rapidly and as a matter of course.

It is difficult to conceive two races farther removed from each other in temperament and tradition than the Anglo-Saxon and the Negro, and yet the Negro in the southern states, particularly where he was adopted into the household as a family servant, learned in a comparatively short time the manners and customs of his master's family. He very soon possessed himself of so much of the language, religion, and the technique of the civilization of his master as, in his station, he was fitted or permitted to acquire. Eventually, also, Negro slaves transferred their allegiance to the state, of which they were only indirectly members, or at least to their masters' families, with whom they felt themselves in most things one in sentiment and interest.

The assimilation of the Negro field hand, where the contact of the slave with his master and his master's family was less intimate, was naturally less complete. On the large plantations, where an overseer stood between the master and the majority of his slaves, and especially on the Sea Island plantations off the coast of South Carolina, where the master and his family were likely to be merely winter visitors, this distance between master and slave was greatly increased. The consequence is that the Negroes in these regions are less touched today by the white man's influence and civilization than elsewhere in the southern states. The size of the plantation, the density of the slave population, and the extent and character of the isolation in which the master and his slave lived are factors to be reckoned with in estimating the influence which the plantation exerted on the Negro. In Virginia the average slave population on the plantation has been estimated at about ten. On the Sea

Islands and farther south it was thirty; and in Jamaica it was two hundred.[1]

As might be expected there were class distinctions among the slaves as among the whites, and these class distinctions were more rigidly enforced on the large plantations than on the smaller ones. In Jamaica, for example, it was customary to employ the mulattoes in the lighter and the more desirable occupations about the master's house. The mulattoes in that part of the country, more definitely than was true in the United States, constituted a separate caste midway between the white man and black. Under these conditions the assimilation of the masses of the Negro people took place more slowly and less completely in Jamaica than in the United States.

In Virginia and the border states, and in what was known as the Back Country, where the plantations were smaller and the relation of the races more intimate, slaves gained relatively more of the white man's civilization. The kindly relations of master and slave in Virginia are indicated by the number of free Negroes in that state. In 1860 one Negro in every eight was free and in one county in the Tidewater Region, the county of Nansemond, there were 2,473 Negroes and only 581 slaves. The differences in the Negro population which existed before the Civil War are still clearly marked today. They are so clearly marked, in fact, that an outline of the areas in which the different types of plantation existed before the War would furnish the basis for a map showing distinct cultural levels in the Negro population in the South today.

The first Negroes were imported into the United States in 1619. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were 900,000 slaves in the United States. By 1860 that number had increased to nearly 4,000,000. At that time, it is safe to say, the great mass of the Negroes were no longer, in any true sense, an alien people. They were, of course, not citizens. They lived in the smaller world of the particular plantation to which they belonged. It might, perhaps, be more correct to say that they were less assimilated than domesticated.

In this respect, however, the situation of the Negro was not

[1] *Documentary History of American and Industrial Society*, Vol. I, "Plantation and Frontier": Introduction, pp. 80–81.

different from that of the Russian peasant, at least as late as 1860. The Russian noble and the Russian peasant were likely to be of the same ethnic stock, but mentally they were probably not much more alike than the Negro slave and his master. The noble and the peasant did not intermarry. The peasant lived in the little world of the *mir* or commune. He had his own customs and traditions. His life and thought moved in a smaller orbit and he knew nothing about the larger world which belonged exclusively to the noble. The relations between the serf and the proprietor of the estate to which he was attached were, perhaps, less familiar and less frank than those which existed between the Negro slave and his master. The attitude of the serf in the presence of the noble was more abject. Still, one could hardly say that the Russian peasant had not been assimilated, at least in the sense in which it has been decided to use that term in this paper.

A right understanding of conditions in the South before the War will make clear that the southern plantation was founded in the different temperaments, habits, and sentiments of the white man and the black. The discipline of the plantation put its own impress upon, and largely formed the character of, both races. In the life of the plantation white and black were different but complementary, the one bred to the rôle of a slave and the other to that of master. This, of course, takes no account of the poor white man who was also formed by slavery, but rather as a by-product.

Where the conditions of slavery brought the two races, as it frequently did, into close and intimate contact, there grew up a mutual sympathy and understanding which frequently withstood not only the shock of the Civil War, but the political agitation and chicane which followed it in the southern states.

Speaking of the difference between the North and the South in its attitude toward the Negro, Booker T. Washington says: "It is the individual touch which holds the races together in the South, and it is this individual touch which is lacking to a large degree in the North."

No doubt kindly relations between individual members of the two races do exist in the South to an extent not known in the North. As a rule, it will be found that these kindly relations had their

origin in slavery. The men who have given the tone to political discussion in southern states in recent years are men who did not own slaves. The men from the mountain districts of the South, whose sentiments found expression in a great antislavery document, like Hinton Helper's *Impending Crisis*, hated slavery with an intensity that was only equaled by their hatred for the Negro. It is the raucus note of the Hill Billy and the Red Neck that one hears in the public utterances of men like Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi, and Governor Blease, of South Carolina.

III

The Civil War weakened but did not fully destroy the *modus vivendi* which slavery had established between the slave and his master. With emancipation the authority which had formerly been exercised by the master was transferred to the state, and Washington, D.C., began to assume in the mind of the freedman the position that formerly had been occupied by the "big house" on the plantation. The masses of the Negro people still maintained their habit of dependence, however, and after the first confusion of the change had passed, life went on, for most of them, much as it had before the War. As one old farmer explained, the only difference he could see was that in slavery he "was working for old Marster and now he was working for himself."

There was one difference between slavery and freedom, nevertheless, which was very real to the freedman. And this was the liberty to move. To move from one plantation to another in case he was discontented was one of the ways in which a freedman was able to realize his freedom and to make sure that he possessed it. This liberty to move meant a good deal more to the plantation Negro than one not acquainted with the situation in the South is likely to understand.

If there had been an abundance of labor in the South; if the situation had been such that the Negro laborer was seeking the opportunity to work, or such that the Negro tenant farmers were competing for the opportunity to get a place on the land, as is so frequently the case in Europe, the situation would have been fundamentally different from what it actually was. But the South

was, and is today, what Nieboer called a country of "open," in contradistinction to a country of "closed" resources. In other words there is more land in the South than there is labor to till it. Land owners are driven to competing for laborers and tenants to work their plantations.

Owing to his ignorance of business matters and to a long-established habit of submission the Negro after emancipation was placed at a great disadvantage in his dealings with the white man. His right to move from one plantation to another became, therefore, the Negro tenant's method of enforcing consideration from the planter. He might not dispute the planter's accounts, because he was not capable of doing so, and it was unprofitable to attempt it, but if he felt aggrieved he could move.

This was the significance of the exodus in some of the southern states which took place about 1879, when 40,000 people left the plantations in the Black Belts of Louisiana and Mississippi and went to Kansas. The masses of the colored people were dissatisfied with the treatment they were receiving from the planters and made up their minds to move to "a free country," as they described it. At the same time it was the attempt of the planter to bind the Negro tenant who was in debt to him, to his place on the plantation, that gave rise to the system of peonage that still exists in a mitigated form in the South today.

When the Negro moved off the plantation upon which he was reared he severed the personal relations which bound him to his master's people. It was just at this point that the two races began to lose touch with each other. From this time on the relations of the black man and white, which in slavery had been direct and personal, became every year, as the old associations were broken, more and more indirect and secondary. There lingers still the disposition on the part of the white man to treat every Negro familiarly, and the disposition on the part of every Negro to treat every white man respectfully. But these are habits which are gradually disappearing. The breaking down of the instincts and habits of servitude, and the acquisition, by the masses of the Negro people, of the instincts and habits of freedom have proceeded slowly but steadily. The reason the change seems to have gone on more

rapidly in some cases than others is explained by the fact that at the time of emancipation 10 per cent of the Negroes in the United States were already free, and others, those who had worked in trades, many of whom had hired their own time from their masters, had become more or less adapted to the competitive conditions of free society.

One of the effects of the mobilization of the Negro has been to bring him into closer and more intimate contact with his own people. Common interests have drawn the blacks together, and caste sentiment has kept the black and white apart. The segregation of the races, which began as a spontaneous movement on the part of both, has been fostered by the policy of the dominant race. The agitation of the Reconstruction Period made the division between the races in politics absolute. Segregation and separation in other matters have gone on steadily ever since. The Negro at the present time has separate churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, Y.M.C.A. associations, and even separate towns. There are, perhaps, a half-dozen communities in the United States, every inhabitant of which is a Negro. Most of these so-called Negro towns are suburban villages; two of them, at any rate, are the centers of a considerable Negro farming population. In general it may be said that where the Negro schools, churches, and Y.M.C.A. associations are not separate they do not exist.

It is hard to estimate the ultimate effect of this isolation of the black man. One of the most important effects has been to establish a common interest among all the different colors and classes of the race. This sense of solidarity has grown up gradually with the organization of the Negro people. It is stronger in the South, where segregation is more complete, than it is in the North where, twenty years ago, it would have been safe to say it did not exist. Gradually, imperceptibly, within the larger world of the white man, a smaller world, the world of the black man, is silently taking form and shape.

Every advance in education and intelligence puts the Negro in possession of the technique of communication and organization of the white man, and so contributes to the extension and consolidation of the Negro world within the white.

The motive for this increasing solidarity is furnished by the increasing pressure, or perhaps I should say, by the increasing sensibility of Negroes to the pressure and the prejudice without. The sentiment of racial loyalty, which is a comparatively recent manifestation of the growing self-consciousness of the race, must be regarded as a response and "accommodation" to changing internal and external relations of the race. The sentiment which Negroes are beginning to call "race pride" does not exist to the same extent in the North as in the South, but an increasing disposition to enforce racial distinctions in the North, as in the South, is bringing it into existence.

One or two incidents in this connection are significant. A few years ago a man who is the head of the largest Negro publishing business in this country sent to Germany and had a number of Negro dolls manufactured according to specifications of his own. At the time this company was started Negro children were in the habit of playing with white dolls. There were already Negro dolls on the market, but they were for white children and represented the white man's conception of the Negro and not the Negro's ideal of himself. The new Negro doll was a mulatto with regular features slightly modified in favor of the conventional Negro type. It was a neat, prim, well-dressed, well-behaved, self-respecting doll. Later on, as I understand, there were other dolls, equally tidy and respectable in appearance, but in darker shades with Negro features a little more pronounced. The man who designed these dolls was perfectly clear in regard to the significance of the substitution that he was making. He said that he thought it was a good thing to let Negro girls become accustomed to dolls of their own color. He thought it important, as long as the races were to be segregated, that the dolls, which like other forms of art, are patterns and represent ideals, should be segregated also.

This substitution of the Negro model for the white is a very interesting and a very significant fact. It means that the Negro has begun to fashion his own ideals and in his own image rather than in that of the white man. It is also interesting to know that the Negro doll company has been a success and that these dolls are now widely sold in every part of the United States. Nothing exhibits

more clearly the extent to which the Negro had become assimilated in slavery or the extent to which he has broken with the past in recent years than this episode of the Negro doll.

The incident is typical. It is an indication of the nature of tendencies and of forces that are stirring in the background of the Negro's mind, although they have not succeeded in forcing themselves, except in special instances, into clear consciousness.

In this same category must be reckoned the poetry of Paul Lawrence Dunbar, in whom, as William Dean Howells has said, the Negro "attained civilization." Before Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Negro literature had been either apologetic or self-assertive, but Dunbar "studied the Negro objectively." He represented him as he found him, not only without apology, but with an affectionate understanding and sympathy which one can have only for what is one's own. In Dunbar, Negro literature attained an ethnocentric point of view. Through the medium of his verses the ordinary shapes and forms of the Negro's life have taken on the color of his affections and sentiments and we see the black man, not as he looks, but as he feels and is.

It is a significant fact that a certain number of educated—or rather the so-called educated—Negroes were not at first disposed to accept at their full value either Dunbar's dialect verse or the familiar pictures of Negro life which are the symbols in which his poetry usually found expression. The explanation sometimes offered for the dialect poems was that "they were made to please white folk." The assumption seems to have been that if they had been written for Negroes it would have been impossible in his poetry to distinguish black people from white. This was a sentiment which was never shared by the masses of the people, who, upon the occasions when Dunbar recited to them, were fairly bowled over with amusement and delight because of the authenticity of the portraits he offered them. At the present time Dunbar is so far accepted as to have hundreds of imitators.

Literature and art have played a similar and perhaps more important rôle in the racial struggles of Europe than of America. One reason seems to be that racial conflicts, as they occur in secondary groups, are primarily sentimental and secondarily economic.

Literature and art, when they are employed to give expression to racial sentiment and form to racial ideals, serve, along with other agencies, to mobilize the group and put the masses *en rapport* with their leaders and with each other. In such case art and literature are like silent drummers which summon into action the latent instincts and energies of the race.

These struggles, I might add, in which a submerged people seek to rise and make for themselves a place in a world occupied by superior and privileged races, are not less vital or less important because they are bloodless. They serve to stimulate ambitions and inspire ideals which years, perhaps, of subjection and subordination have suppressed. In fact, it seems as if it were through conflicts of this kind, rather than through war, that the minor peoples were destined to gain the moral concentration and discipline that fit them to share, on anything like equal terms, in the conscious life of the civilized world.

IV

The progress of race adjustment in the southern states since the emancipation has, on the whole, run parallel with the nationalist movement in Europe. The so-called "nationalities" are, for the most part, Slavic peoples, fragments of the great Slavic race, that have attained national self-consciousness as a result of their struggle for freedom and air against their German conquerors. It is a significant fact that the nationalist movement, as well as the "nationalities" that it has brought into existence, had its rise in that twilight zone, upon the eastern border of Germany and the western border of Russia, and is part of the century-long conflict, partly racial, partly cultural, of which this meeting-place of the East and West has been the scene.

Until the beginning of the last century the European peasant, like the Negro slave, bound as he was to the soil, lived in the little world of direct and personal relations, under what we may call a domestic régime. It was military necessity that first turned the attention of statesmen like Frederick the Great of Prussia to the welfare of the peasant. It was the overthrow of Prussia by Napoleon in 1807 that brought about his final emancipation in that

country. In recent years it has been the international struggle for economic efficiency which has contributed most to mobilize the peasant and laboring classes in Europe.

As the peasant slowly emerged from serfdom he found himself a member of a depressed class, without education, political privileges, or capital. It was the struggle of this class for wider opportunity and better conditions of life that made most of the history of the previous century. Among the peoples in the racial borderland the effect of this struggle has been, on the whole, to substitute for a horizontal organization of society—in which the upper strata, that is to say the wealthy or privileged class, was mainly of one race and the poorer and subject class was mainly of another—a vertical organization in which all classes of each racial group were united under the title of their respective nationalities. Thus organized, the nationalities represent, on the one hand, intractable minorities engaged in a ruthless partisan struggle for political privilege or economic advantage and, on the other, they represent cultural groups, each struggling to maintain a sentiment of loyalty to the distinctive traditions, language, and institutions of the race they represent.

This sketch of the racial situation in Europe is, of course, the barest abstraction and should not be accepted realistically. It is intended merely as an indication of similarities, in the broader outlines, of the motives that have produced nationalities in Europe and are making the Negro in America, as Booker Washington says, "a nation within a nation."

It may be said that there is one profound difference between the Negro and the European nationalities, namely, that the Negro has had his separateness and consequent race consciousness thrust upon him, because of his exclusion and forcible isolation from white society. The Slavic nationalities, on the contrary, have segregated themselves in order to escape assimilation and escape racial extinction in the larger cosmopolitan states.

The difference is, however, not so great as it seems. With the exception of the Poles, nationalistic sentiment may be said hardly to have existed fifty years ago. Forty years ago when German was the language of the educated classes, educated Bohemians

were a little ashamed to speak their own language in public. Now nationalist sentiment is so strong that, where the Czech nationality has gained control, it has sought to wipe out every vestige of the German language. It has changed the names of streets, buildings, and public places. In the city of Prag, for example, all that formerly held German associations now fairly reeks with the sentiment of Bohemian nationality.

On the other hand, the masses of the Polish people cherished very little nationalist sentiment until after the Franco-Prussian War. The fact is that nationalist sentiment among the Slavs, like racial sentiment among the Negroes, has sprung up as the result of a struggle against privilege and discrimination based upon racial distinctions. The movement is not so far advanced among Negroes; sentiment is not so intense, and for several reasons probably never will be. One reason is that Negroes, in their struggle for equal opportunities, have the democratic sentiment of the country on their side.

From what has been said it seems fair to draw one conclusion, namely: under conditions of secondary contact, that is to say, conditions of individual liberty and individual competition, characteristic of modern civilization, depressed racial groups tend to assume the form of nationalities. A nationality, in this narrower sense, may be defined as the racial group which has attained self-consciousness, no matter whether it has at the same time gained political independence or not.

In societies organized along horizontal lines the disposition of individuals in the lower strata is to seek their models in the strata above them. Loyalty attaches to individuals, particularly to the upper classes, who furnish, in their persons and in their lives, the models for the masses of the people below them. Long after the nobility has lost every other social function connected with its vocation the ideals of the nobility have survived in our conception of the gentleman, genteel manners and bearing—gentility.

The sentiment of the Negro slave was, in a certain sense, not merely loyalty to his master, but to the white race. Negroes of the older generations speak very frequently, with a sense of proprietorship, of "our white folks." This sentiment was not always con-

fined to the ignorant masses. An educated colored man once explained to me "that we colored people always want our white folks to be superior." He was shocked when I showed no particular enthusiasm for that form of sentiment.

The fundamental significance of the nationalist movement must be sought in the effort of subject races, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, to substitute, for those supplied them by aliens, models based on their own racial individuality and embodying sentiments and ideals which spring naturally out of their own lives.

After a race has achieved in this way its moral independence, assimilation, in the sense of copying, will still continue. Nations and races borrow from those whom they fear as well as from those whom they admire. Materials taken over in this way, however, are inevitably stamped with the individuality of the nationalities that appropriate them. These materials will contribute to the dignity, to the prestige, and to the solidarity of the nationality which borrows them, but they will no longer inspire loyalty to the race from which they are borrowed. A race which has attained the character of a nationality may still retain its loyalty to the state of which it is a part, but only in so far as that state incorporates, as an integral part of its organization, the practical interests, the aspirations and ideals of that nationality.

The aim of the contending nationalities in Austria-Hungary at the present time seems to be a federation, like that of Switzerland, based upon the autonomy of the different races composing the empire.[1] In the South, similarly, the races seem to be tending in the direction of a bi-racial organization of society, in which the Negro is gradually gaining a limited autonomy. What the ultimate outcome of this movement may be it is not safe to predict.

[1] Aurel C. Popovici, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Gross-Oestreich, Politische Studien zur Lösung der nationalen Fragen u. staatsrechtlichen Krisen in Oestreich*, Leipzig, 1906.

THE PRUSSIAN-POLISH SITUATION: AN EXPERIMENT IN ASSIMILATION

WILLIAM I. THOMAS
University of Chicago

There is a stage of social organization where solidarity of sentiment and action are more essential to the welfare of the group than ideas. This principle holds in the kinship group of primitive times, in the peasant house-community, and has its more absolute expression in animal colonies and gregarious groups.

> Now these are the laws of the Jungle,
> and many and mighty are they;
> But the head and the hoof of the Law
> and the haunch and the hump is—Obey!

The principle of primary or face-to-face relations, which Professor Cooley has made so useful to all of us, is one on which a society may best preserve its life so long as it can preserve a degree of isolation. Moreover, it is a type of relationship which, with its more immediate contacts, its loves and hates, its gossip and hospitality, its costumes, vanities, and self-sacrifices, lies nearer to the primal instincts and contains consequently more sentiment and warmth than is secured through the more abstract relations of the secondary group. In Southeastern and Slavic Europe I was more than once struck by the tendency of the individual of the higher cultural group to drop back into the lower. I am told that there is no case on record of a Magyarized Rumanian, but in Transylvania I met case after case of Rumanized Magyars. I remember particularly one village where an old Magyar woman, who spoke Rumanian very badly, insisted with vehemence, almost with tears, that she was a Rumanian, while the villagers winked and laughed. The Rumanian of this region stands only just above the Gipsy. Another striking fact in this eastern and southeastern fringe of Europe is that the lower cultural groups are, at least temporarily, pushing back those of the higher cultural levels. The Pole of Posen

is pushing back the Prussian, the Ruthenian is pushing back the Pole in Galicia, the Lithuanian is beginning to make headway against the Pole also at another point, and the Italian in Austria is pushing back the German. Naturally the isolated individual tends to be absorbed by the larger group, and the question of the expansion of the populations of the lower cultural levels is largely a matter of the birth rate and of the standard of living, but the question of the solidarity of sentiment in the more primary group and the force of this sentiment when organized toward certain ends, and inflamed through leadership, is an important factor in the struggle for nationality in Eastern Europe, and one which we must consider in connection with racial assimilation in general.

Now, I believe we all recognize that there are no races in Europe, properly speaking. There are only language-groups. But these groups have certain marks, of language, religion, custom, and sentiments, and feel themselves as races; and they struggle as bitterly for the preservation of these marks as if they were true races.

I think it is clear also that the smaller alien language-group, incorporated against its will in the larger state, behaves essentially as a primary group. That the state also behaves somewhat as a primary group in this connection is true, but the state is nevertheless a secondary organization acting through legislation and bureaucracy in its efforts to coerce the sentiments of the alien group and to assimilate it.

Among these efforts to assimilate an incorporated group, I have found those of Prussia in connection with the Poles of its eastern provinces perhaps the most interesting, because the policy was formulated by the man who formed the German Empire, and has been carried on with resourcefulness, system, and ferocity, and because, on the other hand, it discloses in a more complete way than I have found elsewhere the varieties of reaction which the coerced group may develop under this external pressure.

It is estimated by the German that during the nineteenth century 100,000 Germans in the eastern provinces of Prussia were Polonized, that is, they adopted the language, religion, and sentiments of the Poles. During this time the Poles were making no systematic effort in this direction. It seems to me that the main

force in operation was the attractive qualities of the Poles—and their more intimate, personal, face-to-face relations.

On the other hand it seems that the Polish population was at one time on the road to Germanization. In the period of serfdom the peasant had been so mercilessly exploited that he acquired a profound suspicion of the upper classes, and this remains a prominent trait in his character today. It has been hard to convince a peasant that anybody will do anything for him or for his community in a disinterested way. A leading Galician economist, himself peasant-born, informed me that when he returned to his native village and interested himself in its sanitation the peasants speculated on what he was going to get out of it for himself. But in the back of the peasant's head there lingered a tradition that he fared badly because the emperor was deceived by the nobility and did not know how the peasant was treated. And under the German government he began to be loyal (for Germany understands how to care for her people) and for a long time—until after the war with France—she treated the Poles without discrimination—protected them and let them alone. And they in turn began to be patriotic, to speak German and drink beer, and to be proud of the Prussian uniform. A Polish nobleman has recently admitted that if you should put a Prussian Pole into a press, German culture would pour in streams from every opening and pore in his body. Prussian Poles are much sought in Russian Poland and Galicia as agricultural overseers, but they become homesick and long for the time when they may end their banishment and return to Posen. And the aristocractic Poles were coming even more under German influence and unconsciously imitating German institutions and speech. I do not know how far this process of assimilation would have progressed, for there was arising a noticeable nationalistic movement—a movement dating back to the thirties.

At any rate, so long as the peasant felt that the government was friendly to him he paid little attention to agitators. But in 1873 he was attacked by the government. At this point Bismarck took a hand and decided to force the process of Germanization. He said he was not afraid of the Polish man, but of the Polish woman. She produced so many children. He undertook the task

with apparent confidence, but he was profoundly deceived in his judgment of the peasant. He said that the peasant who had shed his blood so generously for Germany was at heart a true German. The fact is, the peasant had been gradually losing sight of the fact that he was a Pole and the policy of Bismarck restored to him that consciousness.

It was a saying in Germany that the Prussian schoolmaster had won the battle of Sadowa, and it was Bismarck's policy to use the same schoolmaster in the Germanization of Posen. The German language was substituted for the Polish in the schools, and German teachers, preferably without a knowledge of Polish, were introduced into the schools. Now speech is one of the signs by which a people recognizes itself, and fear of the effacement of the signs of self-consciousness is somewhat like the fear of death. And this effacement of speech implied also the effacement of religion, for in the mind of the peasant speech and religion were identified. Ask a Pole his nationality and he will not improbably reply: "Catholic." He felt also, and the priest taught, that the good Lord did not understand German. At this point the peasant knew that the government was his enemy. He had heard it before from the priest and the nobility, but he did not believe it.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Prussian government at this point raised a devil which it has not been able to lay. This action, indeed, marked the beginning of what is now known as the Polish Peasant Republic in Posen. The direct consequences of this school policy were riots and school strikes. At Wreschen a number of women who entered a schoolhouse and rescued their children from a teacher were tried for violation of domicile and sentenced to two, three, and five years' imprisonment. In 1906 there followed a systematically organized school strike involving about 150,000 children. The children at the instigation of their parents, the priests, and the press, refused to answer in German. It seems that the behavior of the school officials was on the whole patient. But the strike had the effect of developing in the Polish children a hatred of the Germans. Indeed, this was probably the main object of the organizers of the strike. It may be that the Poles had planned precisely this, and expected no further results.

The next important move of the Prussian government was the establishment of a colonization commission, with the object of purchasing Polish land and settling it with German peasants. This commission has been in operation for 27 years, has expended about $140,000,000 in the purchase of land, and the result is that the Poles have more land than they had at the beginning.

The next important move was a law prohibiting the construction of any buildings without a permit. This virtually meant that the Poles could not build on land newly acquired, nor build further on land already possessed; not even old buildings could be repaired nor chimneys renewed. It may be said at once that the Poles have almost completely nullified the force of this law by buying large estates and parceling them. The peasants then live in the manorial house, in the carriage house, the stable, the barns, the tenant houses, and by packing themselves in like sardines they have found that they save money.

And finally, in 1907 the government passed the expropriation act authorizing the legal seizure of any land which the colonization commission desired but could not purchase. This meant Polish land, and the action was forced by the fact that the Poles had developed so perfect a morale that practically no land was offered to the commission by Poles. This action aroused intense indignation, and was condemned by many Germans, notably by Professor Delbrück, who took the ground that a modern state could not resort to such methods and remain a modern state. It was thought and hoped by many members of the government voting for this measure that it would never be enforced—that it was to be used as a threat—but in 1912 the government began to carry out the policy of expropriation.

These are the main steps taken by the Prussian government in its experiment with the assimilation of the Poles, and the Poles claim that the government is making war on 4,000,000 of its people.

Before outlining the results of this policy I wish to point out that the peasant has been the main factor in the struggle on the Polish side. He was aroused (1) by the Prussian state, (2) by a small middle class of agitators and patriots, (3) by the press, (4) by the clergy, (5) by Polish business men, who developed in him an

immense land hunger and ministered to it. It is noticeable also that the nobility and revolutionary agitators made no headway and secured no effective organization until the national consciousness of the peasant had been aroused. Indeed, I have the impression that, generally speaking, the nobility and the priest were, so to speak, shamed into co-operation with this aroused consciousness of the peasant.

Coming then to the types of organization which the Poles have developed in their struggle with the Prussian, the Marcinkowski Association deserves, perhaps, the first mention, because it is the one important and successful organization antedating the period of Bismarck. Marcinkowski was a physician who after the revolution of 1831 had retired to Paris. But about 1836 a report reached him that the poor people in Posen were complaining of his absence, and he returned. In 1840 he formed a society for the education of Polish youth. His immediate purpose was the formation of a middle class. This society, with its central organization in the city of Posen, has about forty branch associations and gives what we call fellowships to about six hundred Polish young men who are studying in high schools and universities. Wherever these stipendiaries are located not only their studies but their habits are closely watched and reported on by resident Poles. They are also expected to pay back in course of time the money advanced to them, and to make in addition contributions to the funds of the society. An annual list of old stipendiaries making repayments and contributions, with the amounts, is published and commented on. Here, indeed, as everywhere, the Poles make use of comment and criticism very freely. If, for instance, the branch association in Gnesen has been very active and that in Mowglino apathetic, the one is commended and the other rebuked in the annual report. Furthermore, the central association receives all funds collected by the branches, but returns to the branches the amount sent in, with an addition from the funds of the central association. But in this redistribution each branch is treated according to the zeal it has shown. For instance, in one year the district of Scrimm sent in about M. 1,500 and received back M. 5,000, while the district of Znin sent in about M. 400 and received back only M. 500.

Marcinkowski was also very successful in his insistence on what he called the "moral principle," that the nobility and well-to-do Poles who chose not to live in Posen were not released from their obligation to contribute to the Polish cause, but that they were rather under the greater obligation to do so—a sort of penalizing of the non-residents for their absence. This society is also the beneficiary of the courts of honor to which I may barely allude. The Poles are a litigious people, an attitude growing perhaps out of their previous communal system and the troubles arising from the periodical distribution of land. At any rate, going to law may be regarded as their national sport. From the adjudication of these cases the Prussian government was profiting in the way of fines, and the Poles have understood how to form an organization to which litigants voluntarily submit their grievances and to which they pay their fines. These fines are turned over to the Marcinkowski Association. The association has also been more instrumental than any other organization, with the exception perhaps of the press, in drawing the priests into the nationalistic movement. As early as 1841 the archbishop of Posen and Gnesen addressed a circular letter to the clergy of his diocese in which he said: "I urge the priests and chaplains and lay it upon them particularly forthwith to co-operate with this society, which will be a blessing to mankind, and appropriately to assist its noble and useful purpose." From the American standpoint the association is not rich. Its capital is about M. 1,400,000, and about half of its expenses are defrayed from the interest on its capital. Associated with the Marcinkowski Association are four other associations: (1) the West Prussian Educational Association, (2) the Association for Girl Students, (3) the Association for Girl Students of West Prussia, and (4) the Public Library Association.

In 1873 Maximilian Jackowski began to organize the peasants into associations, and in the first year founded 11 such associations; in 1880 he had personally founded 120 associations; at present there are more than 300 associations. During his life Jackowski traveled, wrote, and spoke unceasingly. His two main objects were the improvement of the economic condition of the peasant and the

preservation of the national spirit through a national organization. This organization was to be based on the peasant.

The peasant associations, each under a president, are divided into 26 districts, each under a vice-patron, and all are united in a central association under a patron. The monthly meetings of the associations are devoted to a discussion of matters of agriculture, though they serve also to foster the feeling of nationality. The annual district meetings under the vice-patrons bring out 350 members, and the annual general assembly of the associations in Posen has an attendance of about 1,000. And as the same date of meeting is selected by the Polish Association of Large Land Owners, Trades Unions and other societies, the meeting in Posen in the middle of March assumes the aspect of a national demonstration. Nevertheless politics and sentiment are strenuously disallowed in the meetings of the associations. This is not only essential to the existence of the associations under the Prussian government, but is regarded as intrinsically important. For the Poles thoroughly realize that their success and the realization of their emotional aims lie in business enterprise. They were at one time the most emotional people in the world, or bore that reputation—indeed the Pole has been called the *Slavus saltans*—but there is a legend that a deputation of Poles asked the historian Thierry in Paris what was a good program, and he said: "Get rich." And they have since followed that policy. It is by no means true that they have lost their sentiment; it is the force behind all, but they carry it in a different compartment.

The peasant associations have an official paper, the *Poradnik Gospodarski* ("Agricultural Messenger") which is perfectly adapted to the peasant's needs, and, I may say, to his psychology. The paper is indeed dull reading to the outsider, with its description of drainage, soils, manures, etc.; but we must remember that the peasant has an affection for the soil greater than that for all else; the soil is a part of his being. In the greatest of the novels based on the Slavic peasant, Reymont's *Clopi* ("Peasants"), an old peasant who had received an injury to his head in a fight over some timber, and who had lain in a comatose condition for months, rises from

his bed one night and walks out over his land, and in the morning he is found dead in the fields. He had fallen face foremost, and the earth stopped his mouth and was clasped tightly in both of his hands. By an appropriate automatism he had in death embraced and kissed what was supremely dear to him. A people so disposed responds eagerly to suggestions about the soil. Formerly *Polnische Wirtschaft* was a synonym among the Germans for all that was sluttish. Now it is amusingly inappropriate as applied to Polish agriculture in Posen.

If the primary group is distinguished by face-to-face and sentimental relations I think it is correct to say that the land of the peasant was included in his group. And this land sentiment is the most important factor in the failure up to date of the plans of the colonization commission. It was not, indeed, the plan of the commission to buy peasant land, but to buy large Polish estates and partition them among German settlers. This plan worked very well for some years, because a sufficient morale was not immediately developed among the landed Poles to prevent the sale of some estates. But at the very beginning something occurred which the commission had not counted on—namely the German large land owners in West Prussia were much more eager to sell than the Poles. When it became known that the government was spending about M. 40,000,000 annually for land, there was a stampede of German owners to get in on the money. It was in vain that the commission pointed out that it did not wish German land, only Polish. The German land-owner protested that he was obliged to sell, and that if the government did not purchase he would be compelled, in order to avoid ruin, to sell to Polish speculators. In fact, the commission was compelled to buy German land. As late as 1903 the commission bought from German owners land for about M. 40,000,000; in 1904 for M. 30,000,000; and in 1905 for M. 35,000,000. On the other hand the amount of land offered by Polish owners was always small in comparison with that of German owners, and at present practically no Polish land is offered. For instance, in 1903, 210,000 hectares of German land were offered to the commission, as against 35,000 hectares of Polish land; in 1904, 200,000 hectares, as against 20,000; and in 1905 the Germans offered 135,000 hectares,

and the Poles offered almost none. In this connection land speculation became rife and the price of land has doubled. Polish speculators began to purchase large Polish estates and parcel them out to Polish peasants, and to take over and parcel in the same way German estates refused by the colonization commission. They also began to outbid the government for German land, and to organize parceling banks and other associations to enable the Polish peasant to acquire land. It is here that the land-hunger of the Polish peasant became an important factor. On the Polish side the most daring and inventive land speculator was a certain Martin Biedermann. Among his inventions, two are most notable. The first is known as the "Biedermann clause." A German estate owner offered his estate to the commission. If this was declined he went to Biedermann and sold him the estate, with the reservation that he might have the privilege of withdrawing from the transaction within a month. The deed drawn with Biedermann's firm, say for M. 500,000, contained the following paragraph: "But if a third party [the colonization commission] enters into the transaction before [a given date] said party shall pay M. 30,000 more. But this sum shall be divided equally between the firm of Drweski & Langner [Biedermann's firm] and the estate owner X." At this point the commission might yield and buy the estate, in which case Biedermann's firm had a profit of M. 15,000. Otherwise the estate was parceled among Polish peasants. In the second place, Biedermann understood how to make out of land-buying a patriotic sport for rich Poles. The Pole is socially ambitious and lives very much for the approbation of his circle. Many of the attractive careers are closed to him; he has no place in the army, the government, or the university. If, then, a young man comes into an estate of some millions, and presently a large estate comes onto the market, it is suggested to him that it would be a fine thing to outbid the government and secure this for the Poles. He will have to pay dear, perhaps very dear, for his whistle, but to have his name on every Polish tongue and to be mentioned in many of the 600 newspapers and periodicals in the three parts of Poland is worth the M. 50,000 which he pays in excess of its value.

The heart of the peasant has been won to the Polish cause quite

as much through a system of small parceling banks as through the peasant associations. The peasant is usually in debt. Under the Polish custom the oldest son usually takes over the estate from the father and pensions him, and assumes the obligation of paying to the younger children the worth of their portions. On a small farm there may be ten or fifteen mortgages outstanding. Formerly, at any rate, this was so, and the mortgages were in the hands of money-lenders, some of whom would welcome an opportunity to foreclose. So the peasant led an unhappy and harassed life. The Catholic clergy under the leadership of Wawrzyniak, a truly remarkable man, whom the Poles called the "King of Action," have been active in the organization of the parceling banks. At present, when a peasant is in difficulties, he speaks to his priest or to an officer of the local bank. His affairs are looked into, the small mortgages are taken up, and the bank lends him the necessary money. If the peasant is in trouble through bad management, drink, or other fault of his own, every influence is brought to bear on him to reform him and save his land. If it is necessary to sell a part or the whole of it, it at least does not fall into the hands of the Germans. These banks also furnish the peasant with the means to acquire new land.

Another device developed by the Poles in the land struggle may be called the "great family council," and is based on a peculiar trait of aristocratic Polish society. The noble Polish families are closely related by blood and marriage and show a minute personal interest in the private affairs of one another—a sort of friendly inquisitiveness which we should regard as offensive, but which among themselves is felt to be not only good form but a welcome expression of affection. It is in fact family life extended to a larger circle. This larger family circle is formally represented by a club in the city of Posen called the "Bazar," and not to be a member of this club is not to be in the better Polish world. When now it becomes known that a young land-owner is not living properly, and that he is in danger of coming to ruin, a friend speaks to him and advises him to have a conference with the president of the club. This advice is practically mandatory. If he does not follow it he will receive a note from the president of the club requesting him to call and have a talk. If he ignores this he will be expelled

from the club. One of the by-laws of the club is that a member may be expelled for unbecoming conduct. If he is dropped from his club he is dropped from all the connections in life that mean most to him. So he goes. He is then asked how his affairs stand, what debts he has—everything. If he lies on this point, he is also expelled. He is then informed that a committee will take charge of his estate and place him on an annuity until his affairs are re-established. The most skilled men in Posen will then administer his estate at a nominal charge of say M. 500. He signs an agreement to this effect. A paid overseer may also be engaged for say M. 1,500. In this way the land is not lost to his creditors, above all it does not fall into German hands, and the young man may be reformed. It will be seen that the occasion presents a very favorable opportunity for conversion.

In the course of time the press has become the most violent if not the most influential force in the struggle for the development of Polish national spirit. Every small town has its newspaper, and it cannot be denied that some of the newspapers make a business of working on the emotions of the people in a way that not even the more responsible Polish leaders approve. A few editors in fact make it a part of their business to go to jail, and some papers are said to keep two editors, one to go to jail when the term of the other expires. A Mr. Kulerski, editor of the *Gazeta Grudzionska,* published at Graudenz, when sentenced for "exciting to violence," writes something like this: "Dear brothers and fellow-strugglers: When these words reach you, I shall be no longer a free man, but in prison. Therefore it is my wish to address a few final words to you from the threshold of the prison. My sentence has excited great joy among the Pole-baiters, but the incident may be made to recoil on their heads if you will rally to the support of the *Gazeta Grudzionska:* 500 new subscribers for every day of imprisonment! That must now be your solution of the matter. If in this way 15,000 new subscribers are secured, our Polish cause will thereby secure a powerful impetus." I must repeat that this "business patriotism" has had a wide condemnation, but the *Gazeta Grudzionska* has a subscription list of 100,000.

Frequently recurring themes in the more sensational of the

newspapers are: Poland must become again an independent power; the Poles are neither true nor loyal Prussian subjects; the Prussians are unwelcome guests in the Polish land; no loyal Pole will illuminate his house or otherwise participate in any Prussian demonstration, such as the celebration of the emperor's birthday; the suppression of the Polish language is a device for killing the intelligence of Polish youth, because the mind cannot be developed normally in a foreign speech; no true Polish girl will marry a German; every true Pole will read the Polish newspapers; the German Catholic is the most dangerous and detestable form of Prussian.

Many of the papers have children's supplements, in which they print and answer letters from children, and praise their expressions of patriotism. Commenting on the report that a schoolboy had said: "William II is only a German king; our Polish king is named Ladislaus and is no longer alive," the paper *Praca* said: "This boy is a proof that nature itself rebels with violence and protests against the doctrine that we are or can be true and loyal German-speaking Poles." The development of the boycott of German and Jewish shops and manufactures has been a particular work of the press, and on this point it has been truly ferocious. Some papers have made it a policy to name or give the initials of Poles who buy from "Strangers," or "Hares," that is Germans, or from "Jerusalemites" or "Hook-noses." "The newly wed Mrs. A., a born Pole, and one who should feel herself particularly identified with Poles because she was recently a saleswoman in a Polish shop, was seen entering a German shop." "The Misses B. are patronizing the Jews. Is this a proper way to show respect for their recently deceased mother?" "And from whom has Mr. Anton bought the pretty necktie? It has indeed the national colors, but was bought from 'Strangers.'" "Swói do swoich"—each to his own—that is, Buy only from your own people, has become a slogan. "God will punish those who buy from 'Strangers.'" Lists of Polish shops are printed, and lists of the "friends of our enemies" also. Against those selling land to the Germans the press is particularly violent. The following paragraph is from *Lech* (published in Gnesen), May 4, 1906: "Our community has taken steps,

and properly, too, to enrol in a special book the names of those who for a Judas penny have sold their land into the hands of the colonization commission, and in this book will be indicated also the name of the estate and its size, in order that our posterity may know of the infamous deeds of these betrayers of their country and at the same time of the indignation and contempt expressed by the community for the traitors, and may beware of staining its Polish name and heart by similar actions. It is only to be regretted that the pictures of these vendors are not to be contained in the 'black book.' If we only had their pictures before our eyes and could thus impress their features on our memories then we could easily know from whose path we should step aside, before whom we should spit, and whose hand we should decline to shake; for these infamous rascals who have so shamed our dear fatherland deserve nothing better."

It must be understood that the boycott is very real and that it extends to everything "made in Germany." The organization of the peasants has been used in the attempt to exclude all German agricultural implements and machinery. There was developed a plan to import from England and France everything which could not be supplied in Poland. In this respect the boycott has had only a limited success, for Polish firms have long-established relations with German manufacturers, and buy on long credit, and it has been found impossible to break off with them. In some cases Polish firms have been driven to an arrangement with German manufacturers whereby the latter supply the products, but stamped with the name of a Polish firm. But in general the boycott is very bitter, and this is especially so since the inauguration of the policy of expropriation in the fall of 1912.

There are some special psychological features which have tended to make this a losing fight for the Germans. The old German residents of Posen, as we have seen, were only too eager to sell their land to the government. It is not pleasant to be surrounded by and dependent on Poles. The new settlers also have not been altogether happy in their new home. Posen is not an attractive country in comparison with the Rhine region from which many of the settlers came. It is said that the soldiers of Napoleon exclaimed:

"Et voilà ce que les Polonais appellent une patrie!" But most of all, the old residents and the new have felt that they have a powerful patron in the government—that the government must stand by them, that what the individual does is not important, that the government will live and see to it that they live. School-teachers receive extra pay for serving in Posen, and sluggish and boycotted German merchants send in an appeal to the Ostmark Verein and receive subsidies. This is the weakness of a secondary group. It is the principle of making something out of the government which we are familiar with among ourselves.

There has been also a growing feeling of discontent with the government policy among the large German land owners who otherwise have remained loyal. They have seen themselves gradually surrounded by small German settlers who take the place of the nobility whose estates have passed into the hands of the commission. Their social circle has been broken up and they find themselves isolated. They also feel that German prestige and the leadership of the nobility in politics is threatened by the influx of settlers, whom they call "the coddled children of the state." So in January, 1909, the Association of German Land Owners held a session in which a demand was made that the commission pay less attention to the settling of peasants and more to the development of large and medium-sized estates. "The peasant," they said, "is indeed politically enfranchised and sits in the community assemblies but without the leadership of the large estates and medium-sized estates he would be powerless." This precipitated a countermovement among the German settlers. In March, 1909, 1,000 German peasants assembled in Gnesen and the settler Reinecke spoke on the theme: "Have we a vote or not?" and said: "We demand an advisory voice in the managing body of the colonization commission. We demand more part than heretofore in the provincial government, and we will guard ourselves against the establishment by new settlements of so-called permanent estates whose owners might serve as our leaders politically and economically. For the peasant is very well fitted to look out for his own interests and to choose leaders out of his own number. The Poles are our enemies. Against them we will protect ourselves, but

against our friends may God protect us." And shortly afterward a German Peasant Association was formed. There is then at present a dangerous split in the German forces in the Ostmark, and the Poles have not hesitated to enlarge it. A Pole, Morawski by name, issued a very plausible pamphlet, which was taken seriously and echoed by a part of the German press, in which he sought to show that the nobility, both Polish and German, should combine against the rising peasant democracy, and he pointed out that a German song was already current in the provinces:

> Michel sagt zu seinem Sohne:
> Hol' der Teufel die Barone,
> Ob sie deutsch sind oder Polen,
> Alle soll der Teufel holen.

Finally, the labor situation at present has an ominous outlook for the Germans. Of the laborers on the German estates 80 per cent are Poles, and these are now thoroughly saturated with the Polish spirit. Lately labor has been organized, and is in a position to strike effectively. But between the Association of Polish Laborers and the Association of Polish Estate Owners an agreement has been reached for the arbitration of all differences through committees. It is apparent that the Poles are therefore in a position to call a general labor strike on the German estates, and no greater calamity can be imagined than a general agrarian strike at harvest time. The Poles threatened to call such a strike if the Prussians carried out the expropriation policy. Why they did not do so I do not know, but I think it is because they did not want to disturb business. For, thanks to the land struggle and the train of events which I have indicated, Polish business has expanded enormously. Last year the president of the largest bank in Posen showed me a report of the condition of the bank. During the past twelve months it had done almost exactly the same amount of business that it had done in the whole of the preceding 24 years of its existence. And then there is the Polish woman who is still reproducing her kind in a generous way, and the question of nationality is after all largely a question of the birth-rate. At any rate, the Poles are quoting an old proverb that "the abbey lasts longer than the abbot."

DISCUSSION

ROBERT A. WOODS, SOUTH END HOUSE, BOSTON

The lesson of the progress of the different racial groups in the American population is that they gain strength first by a very strong offensive and defensive inner loyalty. The most capable members of each group develop the power of leadership in intimate relation with this clannish coherence. In due time a sufficient power of leadership, political, economic, and even intellectual, is gained, so that the group leaders begin to qualify as leaders of the general community. By that time the group so represented begins to have general social power and general social respect.

The negroes must in the end win their way in precisely this manner. The appeal to a pitying sense of justice on the part of the whites will never be sufficient. The negroes must learn to organize their economic power, and such political power as they have, under motives of race pride and compact racial assertiveness. If their religious associations were given a little of the varied social effectiveness that characterizes those of some of the immigrant nationalities, there would not be such a deepening emphasis upon the color line.

The tragedy of the situation is that so many of the educated members of the race, upon whom it has the right to depend, spend their energies in calling on high heaven to drop social recognition into their laps, while doing all that they can to paralyze those forms of intrinsic social allegiance upon which alone the permanent progress of the race depends. In the name of equality they destroy the footing of the only system through which equality could either be won or held.

H. A. MILLER, OLIVET COLLEGE

The papers today have shown a remarkable unity of idea, and demonstrate very strikingly the objectivity of subjective phenomena. It certainly would look as though Professor Thomas, Dr. Park, and I had connived to present a common point of view illustrated by our different material. As a matter of fact, my paper was not written for this meeting at all, but I sent it in to see if it could be published in the *Journal of Sociology*, and Professor Small suggested that it would fit into this program. Dr. Park and I used exactly the same figure of perpendicular and horizontal, with different words to express the same phenomena of sentimental and economic classification, although he was describing negroes and I the whole range of European peoples.

AN OUTLINE OF SOCIAL STUDY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

JOHN M. GILLETTE
University of North Dakota

A. INTRODUCTION

The recent developments in our country have abundantly shown that much of the abuse which has arisen in our political and industrial affairs has taken place because of the one-sided and exaggerated individualism which has been fostered in our educational and political system. Our psychology has been individualistic and our moral precepts and teaching have been in the direction of viewing the individual as a separate agent, alone accountable for his success and without obligation to the community which has really produced him. The cure for the bad conditions and the establishment of a better order of things must, in large part, proceed out of a better knowledge on the part of individuals of their place and function in society and of their duty to it. This knowledge cannot be given in a year by way of mere precepts bearing on duty in the abstract but must arise from a long inoculation through concrete teaching about the social relations of the individual and institutions as they are found in action in the community about the youth.

Among the many new educational conceptions which have appeared during the last few years the perception of the need and worth of socializing the child by the use of his social environment is a valuable one. More especially it is to be observed that this socialization is in reality a moralization, for, as Professor Dewey indicates, there is a vast difference between "moral ideas" and "ideas about morality," and what is now needed is the former. Moreover, moralization should be a process in which the emotional attitude of the child is developed relative to social situations so that his moral ideas are moving ideas and in his judgments and reactions to a given situation he identifies himself with the side of

justice and right, thus exercising the very functions in his school career that will be demanded of him in after life.

Much time is now given to discussing "how morality shall be taught." Very largely these discussions run to formulating schemes of teaching morality by precepts and textbooks. It is to be questioned if this formal teaching of morals would make moral people. To quote Professor Dewey, "these moral principles need to be brought down to the ground through their statement in social and in psychological terms. We need to see that moral principles are not arbitrary, that they are not 'transcendental'; that the term 'moral' does not designate a special region or portion of life. We need to translate the moral into the conditions and forces of our community life, and into the impulses and habits of the individual" (*Moral Principles in Education*, pp. 57–58).

It is conceived that the embodiment of the social context of the child in his educational process, thus giving him an understanding of its nature and operations and a sympathy with its best ideals, would be in reality and in a large way moralizing the individual.

As in the case of nature-study, which begins in the early years of the school and gives simple lessons about objects in nature and which becomes more and more complex in the objects considered or in the study of the objects and processes of nature until at the end of the elementary schools it is found capable of being differentiated into the several natural sciences, so there should be a range of social studies which begins with the simple things, the persons or functionaries of the community, in the early years of the school and takes in larger and larger areas of social facts and processes until at the end of the elementary schools the differentiation into the various social sciences may proceed. This is both a preparation for the higher work which will follow if the individual goes on in his educational career, and is a preparation for life in case the pupil is forced to drop off along the way.

It is not intended that this should displace history and civics which we now have. It would rather be supplemental and foundational for both. We are not immediately concerned with what history is considered to be by competent historians. There is a

wide discrepancy between what they would assign as its task and what our textbooks of history in elementary schools actually give. As these have been written, for most part they have emphasized four things: the past, commanding persons, community life on a vast scale, and the disconnected event. Perhaps it could be summed up in saying they have lacked an interpretation of the past life of our nation which would be significant for present life. Could Droysen's definition of history be made more actual, namely, "the effort of the present to understand itself by understanding the past," even then the child mind is likely to be swamped in attempting to secure a vital, working idea of community life, because of, first, the magnitude of the community studied, second, the difficulty of dealing with the past so as to make it directly fruitful for the present.

With only an appreciation of what our competent historians are doing, and with a desire to avoid the appearance of discrediting the teaching of history in the schools, it may be said, I think, that a kind of study is needed as a supplementary study which has for its end the development of the community consciousness as a vital, working part of the individual's life. In my estimation social study, when developed by discussion and experience, should be able to accomplish this. It would be fitted to do this for these reasons: First, it emphasizes the small communities, groups that are within the mental grasp of the child. Second, it makes use of local communities, chiefly, for attaining this aim. The factor of immediate interest or interest in the most immediate things and conditions is brought into requisition. Third, while communities remote in time in the evolutionary sense may be used, nevertheless the point of emphasis is on the present and most of the subject-matter is current. Fourth, the content of the course and the ideational matter is concrete instead of abstract. Interdependence and function may appear to be abstract, but when taught by means of living agents and personages which the child sees and knows they approach the concrete.

Social study thus seeks to build a working community-consciousness. At the same time it keeps in the foreground the ideal community, the ideal conditions of human life, the ideal relation-

ships of man in the service of humanity. Because of this it is a needed foundation for the unraveling and the understanding of the story told in history. It is a value study and gives the child standards of value to measure the worth of the historic events as they are met. It enables history to assume larger significance than it otherwise could.

In like manner it is not civics, though civics may be articulated with it as a phase of social study. For illustration, botany is nature-study but the reverse is not true because the whole is greater than its part. Nature-study, proper, opens up all sections of concrete nature to view. It is the basis of all the sciences, physical, biological, and anthropological. The same is true of social study. It gets at all parts and phases of community life, not merely the political or governmental. There are five or six fundamental phases of social life, or we may call them interests, which are expressed in human institutions or organizations, namely, the means or instruments through which men operate to satisfy these various wants. Some of these important segments of society are domestic, political, economic, religious, aesthetic, cultural, and sociability or "social." Civics covers that small section included in the political. It gives but a fragmentary view of man in his social relations. Social study would therefore supplement this valuable study.

It would also be a foundation for civics. Civics takes up the somewhat specialized study of the functions in society of a section of society, as was just said. Social study would first establish the idea of a larger entity called society, its interdependent, organic, and co-operative nature; secondly, give the idea of the function or service of every person or organization as a part of society; third, give ideals of what society and community life should strive to be, what the individual should be, and what his attitude should be to make possible the realization of progress and betterment. As Professor Small says of sociology:

> Sociology declares that every thing which every man does is connected with every thing which every other man does. Before it is possible to learn this truth except by rote, we must get acquainted with a great number of facts which exhibit the principle. We must learn to see how one act affects another in our own lives; how one neighbor's conduct has to do with another neighbor's

comfort; how the things that we do depend on the things that others have done [A. W. Small, Introduction to Thurston, *Economics and Industrial History*, p. 13].

The following outline for a course in social study must be regarded as being only tentative in nature. It is intended to be a suggestion of what such a course might possibly be. No doubt if others were to undertake the task of formulating an outline, quite different results would ensue. Theoretically, a multitude of such courses might be formulated in which the contents would be somewhat different from course to course. But it is not so easily conceived that the principles involved in their organization could vary greatly. A thorough consideration and discussion of this particular outline would doubtless result in suggestions which would greatly improve and strengthen it.

A course of study of this nature is not entirely theoretical at the present time. At least one state in the Union is conducting an experiment in giving social instruction in its public schools. The essentials of this present social study course covering the first six years' work have been placed in the state course of study for the elementary schools in North Dakota. The experiment is in its second year and the writer of this article has gathered considerable information relative to its use and success. Since this topic is to be a matter of discussion in one of the sessions of the American Sociological Society meeting at Minneapolis in December, the data gathered will be reserved for that occasion. The bibliography which appears in connection with the various portions of the course is intended for the use of teachers. It is apparent that much of it is not adapted to their intelligence, or is inaccessible to them. The greatest difficulty is experienced in finding accessible and usable helps and readings in this line. Special effort will be required to develop it.

B. FIRST FOUR YEARS

In the first four years of school life the child is at the beginning of the larger conception of the world, the idea that there is a larger world of activity than he has enjoyed in the home. The child of six must have played with other children to a degree and discovered that similarities and differences exist between himself

and others. He has found satisfaction in the presence of other children and in carrying on activities with them. Now he is to carry this farther and to gain a larger insight into his powers of enjoyment and action and of pleasure which comes through closer concord and identification of interest. The object of social study in this period is not to get the child to build up and formulate a doctrine of social life or of social give-and-take, but to establish such conditions that the advantages of co-operative action and of mutual usefulness may be recognized.

FIRST YEAR

Expression of the associational sense and the beginnings of converted volition should be accomplished in this year. In so far as the children have attended kindergarten previous to this year, these preparatory steps have been made in a measure. In most cases this privilege is denied. The most natural and obvious means of accomplishing the object mentioned are play and games. Games of the simple sort are especially adapted to put into effect a germinal organization in which a common aim is set up and each participant has a part which makes or mars the success of the whole enterprise. Hence the child discovers that he must control himself and his bodily members in order to play successfully, his disposition is improved, he gains some understanding of human nature, picks up some technique of plans of procedure, may develop some initiative and leadership and some idea of group zeal, loyalty, and devotion. It is perhaps possible in this first year that the intelligent teacher may lead the children to discover the facts of interdependence and co-operation as facts.

It is assumed that play in the succeeding years will be used to further develop the social sense and associational ability. As this is an outline of social study the play phase will be dismissed.

The following suggestions of works helpful to teachers may be made:

Giddings, *Inductive Sociology*, Book II, Part 2, chaps. iii and iv, shows the origin of the consciousness of kind and of concerted volition. Fundamental to give insight and understanding.

Johnson, *Education by Play and Games* (Ginn & Co.). Deals with nature of play and games, play ages, and lists and description of games for each play period.

Bancroft, *Games for the Playground, Home, School and Gymnasium* (Macmillan Co.). Gives repertoire of games and also social and pleasurable elements in them.

Heller, Mrs. H. H., *The Playground as a Phase of Social Reform*, Russell Sage Foundation, No. 31. Proceedings of the Third Annual Congress of the Playground Association of America, a very full outline of all phases of organized play.

Mangold, *Child Problems*, Book II, chaps. i and ii, on play and the playground movement.

The Playground, November, 1912, "Rural Recreation."

Perry, *Wider Use of the School Plant*, chap. vi, "School Playgrounds."

Mero, E. B., *American Playgrounds*, etc. (American Gymnasia Co., Boston, 1908).

SECOND YEAR

A Study of the Home Group

It is quite as obvious that the home group is the social group with which to begin to teach the facts of association as that play is the place of expression of the sense of association and the power to act in concert. It is the medium in which the child has developed thus far, and it enfolds him during the extra-school hours. Further it is the epitome of the larger world in its simpler terms and phases. The beginnings of the larger social life and institutions may be laid bare, such as the common welfare, need of co-operation and division of labor, mutual rights and obligations, law, government, culture, religion, and protection.

Common welfare.—This is probably represented by the word "living" to the child, and may be brought into sight by questions as to what articles and material things are needed for the health, happiness, and support of the home, and as to what is most needed and what the family could get along without.

Co-operation and division of labor.—What does father, mother, sister, brother, hired help do to furnish the things and services needed to make the home? Suppose one should get sick or die or go away, what would happen? What article or service would be missing?

Mutual rights.—How much belongs of food, clothing, heat, room, etc., to father, mother, brother, sister? May one eat all the butter or cake or pie and why? Should mother do all the washing, cooking, etc., if children are large enough to help her? Why? And so for each member of the family.

Law and government.—Are there any rules in the home? Who makes them? Who enforces them? Who decides if the offending member is guilty and what the penalty is? Are there any witnesses in trials? Who is the judge? Do all obey the same rules? May father come in with muddy feet if Johnny may not?

Culture.—Is there a library? Books? Papers? What for? Does anyone talk, tell stories, teach any child? Why? Suppose no one talked or read in the home. Is there music? Pictures? Is not home a kind of school?

And so for religion and protection in the home.

Some helpful books on this year's work for giving suggestions of the function and importance of the family are these:

Small and Vincent, *Introduction to the Study of Society*, Sections 83–87 (American Book Co.).

Henderson, *Social Elements* (Scribner), chap. iv, "The Family."

Elwood, *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* (American Book Co.), 2d ed., chap. iii.

Dealey, *The Sociology of the Family* (Macmillan).

Gillette, *The Family and Society* (McClurg, 1913), chap. i.

Cooley, *Social Organization* (Scribner, 1909), Part I, chap. iii, "Primary Groups."

THIRD AND FOURTH YEARS

A logical advance over the work of the second year is the study of the neighborhood. This should be expansive and suggestive as in the case of the family. Ideas of relationship should develop without dogmatic teachings. The essential ideas obtained through a study of the domestic group may be discerned in the next larger and more complex group, the neighborhood. Questions should be asked to bring out the nature, location, means of carrying on, the purpose, and authorization of the work of the various kinds of workers of the community. Further questions elicit information as to the mutuality of the work done by each, whose needs are fulfilled by it, whether those of the worker, the employer, the neighborhood group, or larger society, or all.

Compensation for service in various ways and the exchange of products and services may also receive interrogations.

The average rural community furnishes the following workers or functionaries who may be the object of the questions: farmer,

teacher, preacher, mail-carrier, blacksmith, carpenter, thresher, farm-hand, house girl, justice of the peace, marshal, school officers, road supervisors, etc. In a village or city other functionaries may be added at will, such as merchants, transfer men, lawyers, doctors, bankers, delivery men, car men, railway employees of various sorts, etc.

A suggestive treatment of the rural and village communities in the development of their functions and division of labor is found in Small and Vincent, *Introduction to Sociology*, chaps. iii, iv.

C. GRAMMAR GRADES

By a gradual evolution in the method of presenting to the child the social matter which surrounds him the teacher has thus far proceeded from mere suggestion and motor attitude to something approaching analysis and exposition of a systematic nature. The grammar grades should see the completion of this development, the more systematic efforts being left to the last years. The more complex phases of groups and situations may be taken up in the fifth and sixth grades and the study should be made more intensive by extending the range of the questions to more ultimate causes and conditions. Perhaps another distinct advance occurs in the ideal pursued by the teacher. The object is to make society appear to the pupils as quite as real and vitalized an object as would the insect, animal, or plant in the nature-study class. In fact, the very object of this social study course is to create in the child's mind that conception of the social world which regards it as a working organism, an interdependent and co-operative system of individuals, which is to serve as an advance on the common idea of so many discreet and independent individuals.

Further, the teaching should be so dynamic with ethical motive that the sentiment of justice and social right, of ideal actions and attitudes shall appear, the social judgments shall be built up and exercised, and the child be led to identify himself with the principle of democracy and fair dealing.

FIFTH GRADE

Either of the groups already studied may be reconsidered in a more intensive manner. But it would probably be better to

develop some other group in this way since a new field might arouse fresh interest, permitting the reconsideration of the others later, if desired. In the following suggestive outline of the intensive study of the school the teacher may adapt the material to the situation by omitting the consideration of such officials or functionaries as are not involved in the school the pupils are acquainted with.

This outline study of the school is taken from the articles on a social science outline by J. S. Welch, *Elementary School Teacher*, May and December, 1906:

[Intensive study of the school.] *a) Principal.*—Consider: selection of teachers and books; arranging course of study; programming studies; noting progress of pupils and advancing them in their school work; care of school property; of individual and school rights; health and safety of pupils; proper janitor service, etc.; service to the social group.

b) The teacher.—Consider: what she is for; how she does her work; the preparation she has made; who benefits by what she does; how she is helped—hindered—in her work; whose loss when she is hindered; how hindrance may be avoided; what she has a right to expect; her service to the school group; to the social group.

c) The janitor.—Consider: what he does; why he does it; why it is important; what the result if neglected; how it may affect us; how he is helped—hindered—in his work; what should be our attitude toward him; why; what are his needs; how are they satisfied; what he exchanges his labor for; we satisfy his needs for what; what he gains; what we gain; what effect his absence would have on our work.

d) The pupil.—Consider: what he is here for; basis of the right; who makes the privilege possible; what he gives in return; the benefit to those who pay for it; who furnishes him the conditions for growth; what his attitude should be toward property; why; toward school books; toward his own books; why; how he is helped to make wise use of books and materials; how the teacher is helped—hindered—in doing this; how the pupil is affected when the teacher is busied with nonessentials; what he has a right to expect from teachers; what teachers have a right to expect from him; what factors make a school; what conditions determine growth.

An alternative study or a supplementary one to the school may be found in a study of a primitive group as a complete organic social body. It is another means of gaining an idea of the simpler forms and institutions of society. Such a group may be the Siouan or the Iroquoian for example. Questions on family, clan, and tribal government, on war and peace, on civil and military chiefs,

on medicine and medicine-men, on religious ideas and rites, on modes of hunting, fishing, raising crops, housekeeping, division of labor between men and women, on education of the boys and girls, on keeping records of events, on communication and language, on implement-making, on mythology, etc., may bring out the salient points.

Expansive helps for teachers in a cheap and accessible form relative to primitive life can hardly be said to exist. But the following references contain some of the matter from which such helps may be derived:

These annual reports of the Bureau of American Ethnology contain sociological studies of the American Indians mentioned: Seminole, 5th report, pp. 475–531; Siouan sociology, 15th report; the Omaha tribe, 27th report, pp. 199–605; the western Eskimo, 18th report, pp. 19–518; both the Prima and the Tlinglit Indians are treated in the 26th report.

Graphic pictures and descriptions of primitive life are contained in Miss Dopp's *Cave Dwellers* and *Tree Dwellers*, and in Waterloo's *Story of Ab* and London's *Before Adam*. Chapin's *Social Evolution* (Century Co.) contains much attractive material on primitive man, tribal society being especially treated in chap. viii.

SIXTH GRADE

As a study for the sixth grade, pioneer conditions may be selected. Such a study would be representative of recent frontier conditions or of those a century ago. This would be especially valuable to give a working idea of how societies got started and how they developed. It would show also how the interdependencies began, and how very desirable they were after people had had to do without them.

a) The land.—Consider: what the prairie (or forest) was like; what was the character of the soil; what kind of vegetation grew; what kind of animals and birds; what advantage the soil, vegetation, and animals would be to settlers; what was the climate and how it affected the newcomers or hindered them.

b) The immigrants or settlers.—Consider: where they came from; whether they were savage or civilized and what difference it would make in them and in what they did; what they brought with them in property, equipment, animals, books, and why; what their personal equipment in knowledge, education, skill, ideas of government, religion, and education, taste, and character; their motives in settling in an unsettled country as related to getting a living and property, their sacrifices in companionship and conveniences, and their curiosity about the region.

c) *The beginnings.*—Consider: why the particular piece of ground was chosen; why the home was located where it was; how the house and stables were built; how the ground was broken (and cleared perhaps); what the man did; what the woman did; which could get along best without the other; how they protected their home from fire and themselves from disease; how they procured or made the articles they needed; what the daily round of work for man and for wife; what amusement or recreation; what was done with their produce; what they got for it.

d) *The coming of others.*—Consider: the birth of children and the differences it made in work and incentive to man and woman; the hiring of a hand and its effect on the household cares, on the man's work, on production, on companionship; the appearance of emigrants; why they came; where they settled; what they brought of goods and information; the changes it made in the life of the original family; how they differed in ideas and personality from each other and the difference it made.

e) *The neighborhood.*—Consider: how the farms are located; the necessity of a survey; how trails and footpaths are used; the likeness of family life and what it makes possible; the exchange of work and co-operation; the beginnings of specialization, the ferry, transportation; exchange of produce; the new store and how it becomes a social center; the appearance of a blacksmith-shop and its effects; the school, and why, results; the church, and why, results; organization of a township, why, effects and services.

Especially helpful books on the fifth-, and especially the sixth-, grade work are:

Small and Vincent, *Introduction to the Study of Society*, chaps. i, ii, on which the outline for frontier life is based.

Thurston, *Economic and Industrial History*, first few chapters on occupation.

Proceedings of the North Dakota Historical Society, Vols. I and II.

F. J. Turner, *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, extracts given in Bullock, *Selected Readings in Economics.*

An alternative or supplementary study to the pioneer community may be found in the correlation of the geographical and social factors of a physiographical unit.

Consider:

a) The topography in its area, configuration, altitude, and water courses, showing how each of these bears out the distribution of population.

b) Climatic conditions in the way of temperature, length of seasons, and amount of moisture precipitation with reference to farming and other occupations, products, etc.

c) Soil and natural resources, such as forests, fish, mines, and waterfalls, in their significance for farming, lumbering, fishing, mining, and manufactur-

ing industries. The kinds of soil and the fertility of the soil would further differentiate occupations.

d) Populations, races, and nationalities, as to origins and characteristics, only in so far as they are necessary to explain differences which retard or promote the regional well-being and in so far as they illustrate the larger world.

e) Industries, in their bearing on the location and distribution of people, their reasons for particular locations, their relation to the life of the region, and their conditioning influences in the establishment and maintenance of commercial relations with the larger world.

f) Transportation and communicating facilities, in their bearing on the prosperity and satisfaction of the region and their influence on locating larger collective populations for commerce and manufacturing. In connection with these last two points much supplementary reading might be done. This is a good place to get out into the larger world by following the threads of communication and transportation to see how they really relate and unify the region with others.

g) Influence of pursuits and occupations on the life of the people of the region in the way of customs, habitations, dress, education, religion, culture, and government.

In addition to one or both of these studies, the civics of the district and township should be taken up by the use of some standard text on civics which treats those items in a working manner.

SEVENTH AND EIGHTH GRADES

Social study in the seventh and eighth grades becomes more mature, reaches out to grasp principles for the solution of problems, gets organized so as to illuminate specific situations, yet must remain essentially concrete, because the pupils are still children. In the seventh year the study of civics may comprise the civics of county and state, the better type of texts affording adequate syllabi for the purpose. The emphasis in teaching should be thrown on functions and duties of officers, good as opposed to bad systems of nomination and election of officers, rather than on the enumeration of offices and mere memorization of election dates. The average civics, especially those on local government, are purely static things, synopses of election dates, names of officers, and dry statements of duties. They are lifeless, and unless the teacher has fire and imagination, a real understanding of our political life, and an enthusiastic conception of what government should be and do, the study will be of slight value. Some of the newer

texts are dynamic and functional. Careful selection will arm the teacher with a competent text as syllabus. In the eighth year the civics study should be devoted to the study of national government, particularly in its working aspects.

A study of how government is actually conducted by means of organized parties which control nomination, election, and therefore legislation and principles of administration, and the popular movements to bring the government closer to the people should be placed in the foreground. Such texts as Foreman's, or James and Sanford's seek to accomplish this end.

The other phase of the social study might be devoted to a consideration of rural social problems. If country pupils are to gain a conception of the specific problems which exist in rural life, the process of enlightenment should take place in school before the bulk of the boys and girls have passed out. In the rural regions there is an especially heavy elimination from school in the later years. In many portions of the nation only a small percentage actually complete the elementary grades. Hence some discussion of these problems should be given at least as early as the seventh grade.

In the absence of published texts on rural social matters which are available for rural teachers, the outline may be made a little fuller. The particular problems or general topics presented here, if the teacher faithfully prepares the material for suggesting a variety of questions on each subtopic and phase, and for interesting information and data, will probably develop the chief points of importance. Naturally the information cannot be offered in a suggestive outline. Sufficient references are given to develop the facts pertinent to most of the topics and subtopics.

I. The Rural Problem.
   1. Origin of: Recent agitation; no agricultural deterioration; exists in perception of improvable conditions; work of the Roosevelt Commission.
   2. What it is:
      a) Improvement in the business of farming: Scientific agriculture; scientific accounts; scientific marketing.
      b) Improvement in education to make schools meet demands of farm life.

c) Improvement in living conditions: The home; the roads; the church.
d) Improvement in association and organization.
e) Improvement in health and recreation.

3. How to meet it: By agitation; by discussion; by co-operation; by organization.

References.—Butterfield, *Chapters in Rural Progress*, chap. ii, "The Problem of Progress"; Fiske, *The Challenge of the Country*, chap. i; Kern, *Among Country Schools*, chap. i, "The New Country Life"; Bailey, *The Housing of the Farmers*, pp. 6–25; *Rural Life Commission Report* (Sturgis & Walton Co.); Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology* (Sturgis & Walton Co.), chap. v.

II. The Problem of Better Agriculture.

1. Soil sterilization: Methods of its accomplishment: one-crop method; poor cultivation.
2. Soil improvement: Rotation of crops following fertilization; soil inoculation; improved cultivation.
3. Advantages of diversification: Makes farming more stable and certain; uses labor supply to better advantage; feeding stock produce makes double profit.
4. Keeping accounts of farming:
   a) What it covers: Fields seeded, with area, location, varieties, time, cultivation, amount of seed, amount of produce; cost of labor, seed, machinery used, of feed and horse-power; amount of sales.
   b) Advantage: Gives record of what is profitable and unprofitable, and degree of profit of given produce; puts farming on business basis.
5. Marketing organization:
   a) Agencies which absorb farmer's profits: Middlemen; line elevators; railways.
   b) Protective agencies: Co-operative societies; American Society of Equity; Farmers' Union.

References.—Butterfield, *Chapters in Rural Progress*, chap. iii, "The Expansion of Farm Life"; Bailey, *The State and the Farmer*, chap. i; Fiske, chap. iv; Harwood, *New Earth*, chaps. iii, vi, x, and xv; Gillette, chaps. vii, viii; United States Agricultural Department, *Farmers' Bulletins*, Nos. 28, 44, 54, 132, 242, 245, 257, 315.

III. Social Phases of Grain Raising.

1. Wheat raising (as sample): Social importance.
2. Soil and seeding:
   a) Importance of good seed: Purity; vitality; adapted to the region.

b) Preparation of the soil.
c) Seasons for seeding.

3. Climate and wheat growing: Conditions or ranges of temperature; moisture; distribution of rain in seasons.
4. Machinery and wheat growing:
   a) Kinds used in production.
   b) Comparison with former methods.
   c) How they are made and sold.
5. The farmer and the wheat market:
   a) His dependence on the market by reason of his specialization.
   b) The fact of competition with other producers.
   c) Supply and demand, and price.
   d) Middlemen organizations and control of price.
   e) Transportation system as necessary to connect with market: What it gets; can farmer set freight rates?

IV. Rural Labor.
1. Deficiencies in rural labor:
   a) Supply lacking at time of need.
   b) Vicious and unreliable characters.
   c) Unspecialized and untrained for farming.
2. Reasons for labor problem:
   a) Dislike of farm work.
   b) Dependence on floating city population.
   c) Irregular, partial, and seasonal demands for farm labor.
3. Betterment of conditions:
   a) Develop work for labor throughout the year, so as to hold the supply in the country.
   b) Provide for labor families to encourage permanence and give living advantages.

References.—Gillette, chap. x; Fiske, pp. 74–82.

V. Making Farm Life More Attractive.
1. Why people leave the farm:
   a) Social attractions of cities.
   b) Improved living conditions in cities.
   c) Low estimate of farming and farmer.
   d) Hard work and drudgery.
   e) Cultural disadvantages.
2. Making home attractive:
   a) Improved homes: Heating plants; bathing facilities; inside toilet; improved kitchen devices.
   b) More books and periodicals.
   c) Beautification of home.
   d) Beautification of grounds.

e) Music.
f) Making cooking scientific.

3. Making outdoor work attractive:
   a) Use of labor-saving machinery: Windmills; gasoline engines or other motor power for machines run by hand; milking machines; riding machinery.
   b) Shorter hours and faster pace.
   c) Diversification of crops and industry to distribute work and decrease need of rush.
   d) Scientific agriculture to increase intellectual element.
4. Improved roads for quick communication, travel, and visiting.
5. Social center for associational purposes.

References.—United States Department of Agriculture, *Farmers' Bulletins*, Nos. 1 and 5, "Beautifying the Home Grounds"; No. 270, "Modern Conveniences for the Home"; No. 126, "Practical Suggestions for Farm Buildings"; Henderson, *Social Spirit in America*, chap. ii, "Home Making as a Social Art"; Gillette, chaps, vi, ix, xii; Fiske, chap. iii; McKeever, *Farm Boys and Girls*, chaps. iii, iv, v, x, xiii, xv.

VI. The School and Farm Life.
   1. Conditions of a vigorous living school: Professionally trained teachers; large number of pupils to create interest; grading and classification; good buildings and equipment; regular attendance.
   2. Defects of rural schools: Untrained teachers; small number of pupils; irregular attendance; lack of graded system; small, poorly heated, poorly ventilated buildings; city-made course of study, books, and ideals; absence of training for the chief business of the community—agriculture and domestic economy.
   3. Remedies: Consolidation most advantageous because it attracts better teachers, makes attractive, differentiated, and equipped buildings which permit grading, teaching of agriculture, manual training, and domestic economy; transports pupils, thus securing better attendance; multiplies pupils, which makes for enthusiasm; provides a center for the varied social needs of the community; and furnishes organized play and recreation so much needed in country life.

References.—Foght, *The American Rural School*, chaps. i, v, vii, ix, xi, xv; Kern, *Among Country Schools*, chaps. ii, x, xii, xiii, xiv; United States Department of Agriculture, Bulletin No. 232, "Consolidated Rural Schools and Organization of a Country System"; Gillette, chap. xvi, references at end of chapter; Fiske, chap. vi; McKeever, chaps. xvi, xvii; C. C. Schmidt, "The Consolidation of Rural Schools," *Education Bulletin No. 3*, University of North Dakota, 1912, probably the best work on the subject.

VII. Rural Hygiene.

1. Social importance of good health:
   a) The poor, the defectives, and the criminal classes spring from devitalized classes.
   b) Physical weakness produces unhappiness, irritation, bad disposition.
   c) Sickness a great inconvenience and expense.
2. Menaces and suggestions as to rural health: Infected water supply; neighboring barnyard filth; uncleanness in production of milk supply; emptying slops in yard; uncared-for closets; stagnant pools; exposure and colds; bad teeth; eyestrains, poor hearing, and poor breathing, especially of school children; bad methods of preserving and keeping food; propagation of germs by drinking-cups, pencils, books, etc.; patent medicines; want of proper bathing facilities.
3. How schools may be made sanitary: Scrubbing floor; whitewashing plaster; painting woodwork; jacketing the stove; window ventilators; covered water tank; cleansed and disinfected closets.

References.—Allen, *Civics and Health;* Foght, *The American Rural School,* chap. xiv; Gillette, chap. xi, with references; Isaac Bemer, *Rural Hygiene;* Kern, *Among Country Schools,* chap. v.

VIII. Good Roads and Farm Life.

1. Significance for civilization: Roads in Roman Empire; roads in Europe today.
2. Social function of roads: Local transportation of produce; interchange of courtesies; growth of ideas and fellowship; basis of prosperity of schools, lodges, churches, sociables, entertainments, spelling-matches, musical classes, etc.
3. Economy of good roads: Saving in hauling; saving in wagons and horses; increased value of land; speed and pleasure in travel.
4. Methods of securing roads: "Working the roads"; cash wages; working prisoners; state aid as local support.
5. Kinds of country roads: Earth roads and split-log drag; sand-clay roads and puddling; burnt clay roads and lining; dust preventive; hard roads—gravel, shell, stone.

References.—United States Department of Agriculture, "Roads and Road Building," "Macadam Roads," "Use of the Split Log Drag," *Farmers' Bulletin,* No. 321; Fiske, chap. iii; Gillette, chap. ix; Henderson, *Social Spirit in America,* chap. vi.

IX. Socializing Country Life.

1. Facts of lack of social life in country as compared with city: Churches; theaters; neighbors; public balls; amusement places; recreation; libraries; culture clubs, etc.

2. Causes of social poverty: Isolation; bad roads; absence of large and specialized buildings; individualistic philosophy; depreciation of play and recreation; lack of reading-habit; the work-habit.
3. Means of socialization: Good roads; automobiles; telephones and rural delivery; schools and churches built for social purposes; farmers' organizations such as institute, grange, American Society of Equity, farmers' unions, etc.; mothers' clubs and literary clubs among women; athletic meets and tournaments at school grounds; literary and debating clubs; spelling-matches; lectures and entertainments; moving-picture shows; banquets, feasts, and "socials."

References.—On social isolation: Butterfield, *Chapters in Rural Progress*, pp. 17–22; Bailey, *Insufficiencies in Country Life*, "The Training of the Farmer," pp. 15–19; Butterfield, "The Country Church and Progress," chap. xii; *School Buildings for Social Purposes*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin No. 232, on consolidated schools; Foght, "Libraries for Rural Communities," chap. xiii, and Kern, chap. vi; Johnson, *Education by Play and Games*, "Organized Play and Recreation"; Butterfield, "Farmers' Institutes," chap. vii, and Kern, chap. ix; Butterfield, "The Grange," chap. x, "Opportunities for Farm Women," chap. xi; Fiske, chap. v; Gillette, chaps. xiii–xviii; McKeever, chaps. vi–x.

THE LARGER SOCIAL WORLD

The larger side of social life, that which reaches beyond the local community into the nation and world, may be developed by means of a brief discussion once or twice a week of the events which are transpiring in the world at large. This should be done in a manner that would made each event treated mean something for life by showing how it changes conditions and thus makes for improvement or deterioration.

A brief treatment and discussion of certain phases of our industrial history would also be useful to cultivate the idea of the articulation of ourselves with the world and to give an understanding of some of the pressing economic issues. The little weekly paper entitled *Current Events*, published in Springfield, Massachusetts, is recommended as exceedingly useful to accomplish the former purpose. Thurston's *Economic and Industrial History* would give the material for the second, and on account of its size is quite usable. Coman's *Industrial History of the United States*, or Bogart's *Economic History of the United States* are fuller and more pretentious. It would be sufficient to select only the more recent problems of labor and industry.

ROUND TABLE

SOCIOLOGY IN THE NORMAL SCHOOL

F. R. Clow, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, Presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN

This round table is almost an impromptu affair. The tentative program of the Society appeared early in December with its announcement of "Social Assimilation" as the general subject. This subject, combined with the place of meeting, seemed to me to present an opportunity to accomplish a needed work. Under date of December 13 I sent out a circular letter to the normal schools of the North Central states which was in part as follows:

"The most extensive process of assimilation going on in this country is found in the schools. Eighteen million young persons are being made over so as to better fit them for their respective places in our common life, and two million fresh ones come under the process each year. If sociology can aid in this process, surely teachers should have an acquaintance with it. Minnesota and the neighboring states are the ones in which the state normal schools have the strongest support. During the past eighteen years, beginning with Minnesota in 1895, these states have quite generally given sociology a place in the curricula of their normal schools. So far, however, there has been no organized co-operation in the matter, at least between states. Has not the time now come for a concerted attack on the problem of sociology as a study for the professional training of teachers? Is not the approaching meeting in Minneapolis a good opportunity to plan such an attack?"

A few days later President Small informed me that our normal-school conference would have a place on the final program. Accordingly I sent out another circular letter to the normal schools conveying this information and urging attendance.

In the session of the Sociological Society last Saturday afternoon, while we were discussing practical applications of sociology, there was frequent mention of its application to education. One speaker even suggested that the department of sociology in the university should annex the department of education. An important application of sociology to education is its use in the training of teachers. We are to consider this morning just one part of that, namely, the use of sociology in the normal schools.

Permit me to introduce this subject to you in somewhat the order in which it has come to me. When I began my work in the Oshkosh Normal School in 1895 my chief interest was in economics. I sent out a questionnaire to the other normal schools of the country to find out what they were doing with the

subject. My questionnaire came back from the normal school at Winona in this state with the information that "social science" was taught there instead of economics. Small and Vincent's *Introduction* was the basis of the work. As far as my information goes, this was the beginning of the teaching of sociology in the normal schools of this country. The teacher was Mr. Manfred J. Holmes, now at Normal, Illinois. In response to my suggestion that he attend this meeting and to tell about his pioneer work, he replies as follows:

"How sorry I am that I cannot go to Minneapolis as you suggest and tell a little about the 'pioneering' of sociological work in the education and training of teachers. I expect to be at the National Education Association in July and if needed might help out at that time."

In 1896 President L. D. Harvey, of the normal school at Milwaukee, now president of Stout Institute at Menomonie, introduced sociology into his school, teaching it himself. He did this, so he has written me, not from interest in the subject, for he had never studied it in college or university, but from interest in education. He wished his students to go out to teach with the habit of trying to understand the community in which they worked. There has been a class in sociology in the Milwaukee Normal every year since then. Here is President Harvey's reply to my notice of this meeting:

"I should like very much to attend your meeting because I have been deeply interested in the subject of sociology in the normal school for a great many years. I am glad to see that it is coming to have some recognition. When I proposed it in an experimental way, it received very little recognition. I felt then that it was the proper thing and that it would justify itself. I regret that it will be impossible for me to attend the meeting."

In 1902 the Board of Regents of Wisconsin normal schools extended to the other schools of the state the permission to give sociology as an elective which President Harvey had secured for Milwaukee. At Oshkosh we at once set about introducing it. We had our first class in the second semester of 1903–4. Up to 1909 there was one class a year, usually with less than ten students. In the summer of that year the president and I agreed that sociology is more valuable for intending teachers than economics. Accordingly, sociology was put into the first semester as well as the second, and economics was dropped for a time. Since then we have had two sociology classes a year of from fifteen to thirty-five students each.

So far only these two of the eight normal schools in Wisconsin had sociology. It has since been introduced into the other schools as follows: Stevens Point, 1911; River Falls and La Crosse, 1912; Whitewater, 1913. In all of these it comes in the second semester. Superior has also introduced it recently. Only one normal school in the state, that at Platteville, is still without sociology in its curriculum, and there they have a year's work in economics.

Last October the teachers of economics and sociology in all eight schools met at Madison, together with a sociologist and an economist from the faculty of the state university. The reports regarding sociology in the normal schools

were uniformly favorable. The conference voted that sociology should be made a required study in curricula leading to the regular teacher's diploma. There was one dissenting vote to this: the Platteville man feared that such a requirement would cut down his economics.

In the spring of 1910 I sent out a questionnaire regarding sociology to the normal schools of other states. The results were published in the *American Journal of Sociology* for October, 1910. At that time about half of the normal schools in the North Central states taught sociology. In the East and South there were very few. Since then the number has increased in all parts of the country, except possibly in the East.

In my circular letter of December 13 I stated five questions:

"1. Should sociology be made a fundamental study in the professional training of teachers, somewhat as psychology is at present?

"2. Should it be made a required study in the two-year curriculum which most normal schools offer to high-school graduates?

"3. What should be the content of such a course in sociology?

"4. Should the American Sociological Society appoint a committee to consider the place of sociology in the training of teachers?

"5. Should the officers of the National Education Association be asked to give this subject a place in the program of its forthcoming meeting in St. Paul, and appoint a committee to co-operate with a committee of this Society?"

Some normal-school men who are not able to attend this conference have sent their answers to these questions by letter.

From Newell D. Gilbert, De Kalb, Illinois:

"1. My sociology students unanimously say Yes. Or they ask spontaneously, Why is it not required? Certainly it gives an essential view of the situations which courses of study and methods of organization and teaching are meant to meet.

"2. Am inclined to say Yes.

"3. Mainly an intensive study of concrete and living social problems. Ellwood's *Modern Social Problems* will serve for a type as against a systematic presentation as a science.

"4. Excellent idea.

"5. Nothing better."

From Gustav S. Petterson, Mankato, Minnesota:

"I believe strongly in making sociology a required subject in the training of teachers. Yet for the present my experience is that we get the students anyway, even though the course is not a required one. Eventually it will be made required, in my opinion, but care should be exercised in working out these requirements.

"Some of the specific subjects that need to be considered in the content of the course are: (*a*) problems of assimilation and amalgamation here in America; it is just as necessary that a teacher know the physical, mental, and moral characteristics of the various peoples dealt with as to know the

laws of mental development; (*b*) rural sociology and economics; (*c*) the functions of social institutions, and what the fundamental social forces are; (*d*) problems of the dependents, defectives, and delinquents. In general I aim to consider social problems and not philosophical or technical sociology. Other subjects than the above may be found necessary.

"With questions 4 and 5 I am in hearty accord."

From President Willis E. Johnson, Ellendale, North Dakota:

"Answers to the questions to be considered should all be in the affirmative, excepting, of course, the third question. As a matter of fact I wish I had a better conception as to the content of a pedagogical course in sociology."

From President George H. Black, Lewiston, Idaho:

"I am glad to be able to inform you that sociology has been one of our regularly required subjects, in our Senior and Junior years, for the past five years. We devote as much time to that subject at the present time as is devoted to the study of psychology. This year we have put in one additional course, open to those who are taking special training for teaching in rural schools. This course we designate as rural sociology.

"I should be very glad indeed to assist in any way I can in aiding you in the work of having this subject made a part of the curriculum of a standard normal school. It happens that I am one member of a committee appointed by the National Education Association to investigate the subjects of the curricula in state normal schools, and to propose a standard curriculum for such schools. This committee will hold its next meeting at Richmond, Virginia, during the meetings of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. I shall be glad to present for the consideration of this committee any requests which you deem wise to make in behalf of the teaching of sociology."

CONTENT OF THE COURSE IN SOCIOLOGY GIVEN IN THE STATE NORMAL SCHOOL AT OSHKOSH, WISCONSIN

(*Read by title only*)

F. R. Clow, State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wis.

Part I. Introduction.

1. Sociology.
2. Education.
3. Sociology and the Training of Teachers.

Part II. The Factors of Society.

4. Location.
5. Population.
6. Human Nature.
7. Communication.

PART III. SOCIAL ORGANIZATION.

8. Primary Association.
9. Social Mind.
10. Social Classes.
11. Institutions.
12. Government.

PART IV. SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS.

13. The Family.
14. The State.
15. The Business Undertaking.
16. Cultural Institutions.

PART V. SOCIAL PROGRESS.

17. The Human Episode.
18. Variation.
19. Natural Selection.
20. Telic Selection.

There is nothing sacred about the foregoing scheme. We make the divisions very distinct, however, and group them carefully because the learner masters a new subject more readily if he finds it blocked off into convenient units; but he is free to block off the undivided reality to suit himself whenever he is inclined to undertake it. The aim of the course is to work out the simpler principles of sociology as in any beginner's course, but with the one difference that the illustrative matter is taken chiefly from education.

The full treatment of the factors of society belongs to other sciences. We merely assemble them here to have the data from which sociology must start; we then know where to look if any of them are challenged. Location is a topic soon disposed of, because geography usually receives full treatment in elementary curricula. Population, on the other hand, holds us longer. We notice the distinction which Professor Giddings has taught us to make between a genetic aggregation and a demotic aggregation. This has an important application for the migratory teacher. A community that is predominantly genetic is certain to be conservative; the people have their standards and cannot easily be induced to adopt others. A community, on the other hand, like a five-year old city in Idaho about which I learned recently, having a population drawn from every state of the Union and every country of the globe, has no standards of its own, in education or in any other form of culture; but it has boundless ambition and wants the best of everything; it wants educational experts of the latest type for its teachers, and gives them a free hand provided they soon show results. Then there is density of population. The results of this economics has worked out the best. It affects education by its bearing on the extent to which schools can be specialized. If the pupils are few, there can be little variety in the teaching; the teaching can be as broad and advanced as human culture itself only where there are large numbers

of pupils. In rural regions education is both poorer and more expensive per pupil than in cities. Then there is the age distribution of the population. In the state of Nevada the children under fourteen years of age make only 20 per cent of the total population as against 30 or 40 per cent in some other states. We also study the teaching population by itself: age distribution, proportions of males and females, distribution according to nationality of parents, proportion of teachers to total population. Take this last point for illustration. Teachers were first enumerated separately in 1850, and they then made only thirteen in every thousand. Since then the proportion has increased at every census. In 1870 it was almost exactly one-third of 1 per cent. In 1900 it was fifty-eight in the thousand. These figures are a measure of the growing importance of education: the proportion of the population devoted to teaching increased over fourfold in fifty years.

Part III is the most substantial portion of our course. The title we have appropriated from Professor Cooley, as also some of the section titles and not a little of the thought. Primary association, or the primary group—to keep Cooley's term—is the topic which the students take hold of with the greatest avidity: the collection of first-hand accounts which they have given me is richer on this topic than on any other.

Illustrations of social mind occur in a school faster than an observer can write them down. A person enters the schoolroom quietly from the rear. The pupils near by hear and turn their heads to look; this attracts the attention of others and they turn to look, until nearly all in the room have had their look. A teacher watching the children on the playground is able to see wave after wave of movement start and spread, some to die out soon and others to extend to the uttermost limits. A more enduring phase of the social mind we find in the peculiar attitude of a class which makes it different from every other, for, as every teacher knows, no two classes are alike. Here is the observation of a practice teacher:

"I have two writing classes, the Sixth A and the Sixth B. I use the same lesson plans and the same writing copies for both classes, but there is a marked difference in the work of the two classes. The A's are noisy and careless. The B's are quiet and diligent, doing their work as well as the A's and sometimes better. The A's seem to think that I am not capable of teaching the subject."

One of the fascinating occupations of a teacher is to watch the development of these class attitudes and try to account for them. Here are the reports of two practice teachers:

"In my practice class the children were bound to play with their ink wells when I was not watching. One day Gladys tipped the ink all over her new dress. That trouble has practically ceased."

"I had an extremely indifferent class. About the middle of the quarter a girl entered from another school who was bright and interested. Some of the old members of the class were jealous at first, then they began to wake up. This quickened the pace of the whole class, and in time most of them did better work."

Those processes in the social mind, largely subconscious, which arrange people in castes and classes, go on in the schoolroom as everywhere else, sometimes helping out our conscious plans, and sometimes frustrating them. These are most in evidence at a reception—a gathering of students which does not occur frequently enough to develop permanent groups but which leaves them free to arrange themselves as they like.

When we take up institutions, students readily come to see that an organization, such as their athletic association or debating society, is simply a group of persons held together by a permanent form of the social mind. Viewing it at a given moment, we see the persons; but following it through a period of years we see that only the form endures.

Government also is readily seen to be a universal element in social organization. It pervades the school and all the subsidiary organizations connected with it. The literary society has its government, the football squad has its government. Executive, legislative, and judicial procedure, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, retributive punishment and reformative punishment, loyalty and graft, efficiency and inefficiency in government, with all the causes that lie back of either, may be illustrated by the students themselves from what goes on within their own organizations.

In Part IV we study the fundamental institutions as concretely and intensively as our time and facilities permit, with the aim of seeing, first, how the principles developed in Part III apply, and, secondly, how every institution has some bearing on education. When my class met just before the holidays we were studying the family, and when we return after the holidays each one of us is to bring a written description of some family we have had opportunity to observe with special attention to the conditions which affect childhood. This first-hand information will doubtless call our attention to the declining birth-rate, the cost and inconvenience that children involve in a city family, the lack of opportunity to play in the city, and the more serious lack of opportunity to work. We shall notice the excessive stimulation that life in the city gives, often of unwholesome kinds, and the consequent importance of developing self-control, together with right understanding and habits in regard to work, the use of money, the relations between the sexes and many other subjects. It is of course evident that these conditions lay a heavy responsibility on the school.

Our study of the business undertaking is not an attempt to condense or restate the principles of economics, but a study of the group of persons organized for business purposes, with social classes and a government after the plan of any other institution. We notice the great variety of occupations—the census distinguishes over three hundred—and the consequent need of each child for guidance in choosing a vocation and making proper preparation for it. Then we see what the schools are doing in these respects and how far they fall short of the need.

Part V begins with a hasty glance at man's past and future on the earth,

which comes, in the syllabus now in use, under the fanciful title of "The Human Episode." We look backward through the years of which our oldest contemporaries tell us, then through the revolutionary changes which were in progress a century ago, then back to the beginning of modern history, then to the beginning of historical time six or seven thousand years ago. Then we look still farther back through archaeological time a hundred thousand years or more, noting Morgan's three stages of barbarism and three stages of savagery; then through geological time, with its estimates in millions of years. Astronomical time back of that has no years and no beginning. Then we turn our gaze forward. What will the population of this country probably be in 1920? In the year 2000? When the year 3000 comes, how many paupers will there be, how many illiterates, how many defectives? When the agricultural resources of the earth become developed to their utmost how many people will find subsistence? These questions may not receive answers, but they concern us none the less. Finally, we ask the physicists and astronomers how long the earth will retain its moisture and atmosphere and other conditions necessary to sustain human life. They will not answer, even approximately; they admit that it will be a long time, some millions of years, but that there will be an end some time. We see, therefore, that, although we have grown out of a long past, our future is still longer and at the same time immeasurably greater.

The next two sections present the theory of evolution, beginning with the biological principles underlying it and then applying them to the development of human society. We do a little figuring on birth-rates and death-rates to see how natural selection in a century or two eliminates a people that leaves scanty room for children in its social arrangements. We see how natural selection gives us much of what we have in education, down to the tricks by which teachers get their positions. Lastly, we observe its working in the habits of the individual in such matters as methods of studying a lesson or teaching a class.

This gets us ready for the concluding section, with the title which Lester F. Ward taught us to use. We see in our own lives how we avoid waste and misfortune and sorrow if we take account of our resources, husband them, and use them for remote success rather than immediate gratification. We see how society can do the same for itself in proportion as its collective action becomes wise. And what is education but the effort of society to become wise in the next generation? The eighteen million young persons in our schools are being assimilated—deliberately made over, in body, mind, and character, as far as our educational technique renders it possible—to fit them, not for the society that now is, but for the society that is to be. Should not teachers, of all persons, understand society—what it is, whence it has come, and whither it is going, or can be made to go, or can be equipped to choose its destiny for itself? As Professor Ellwood says, "The task of social regeneration is essentially a task of education."[1]

[1] *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, p. 317.

J. T. House, Wayne, Nebraska

(*Abstract*)

I teach sociology in one of the four normal schools in Nebraska. It is taken mostly by men going to the university, rather than by students preparing for teaching. We use Small and Vincent's text. It is not necessary to have a definite course in sociology in order to be able to teach it. We can teach it incidentally in connection with other studies. I believe in putting it into history.

John M. Gillette, University of North Dakota

I have very firm convictions about the possibility and desirability of teaching sociology in normal schools and in other institutions outside of colleges and universities. They are founded on my philosophy of education, on my belief relative to the value to be derived from the study of sociology on the part of intelligent persons, and on my own experience as a teacher of the subject in a normal school.

Since facts pertaining to the status of sociology in normal schools in the various states are called for in this conference, I may be pardoned for alluding to my own experience. I served as teacher of history and sociology in the state normal school at Valley City, North Dakota, from 1903–7. While sociology was provided for in the curriculum of that institution, nothing had been done toward teaching it. The course of study called for one term a year. I initiated the course at once, using Henderson's *Social Elements*. The attendance for each of the four years was about as follows: 11, 17, 25, 60. In the fourth year almost as many more were turned away, since I deemed them ill prepared to do the work and the class was already too large. I found no more difficulty in teaching the subject to that grade of students than in teaching history or economics.

My successors at Valley City, not having a sociological training—a chronic condition of teachers in normal schools who are called on to teach sociology—have done little or nothing with the subject. The state normal school at Mayville has given instruction in the subject continuously for at least seven or eight years. I doubt if the new normal at Minot has introduced it as yet.

With the permission of this conference I should like to say something about our social study course in the elementary schools of North Dakota.

Several years ago the State Educational Association appointed a committee of seven to investigate the elementary-school system of the state with a view to improving it. This committee used me at times as advisor. To this committee I suggested the advisability of recommending that a social study course be adopted by the schools. It then called on me to prepare a brief synopsis of such a course. The report of this committee was adopted by the State Association and it was recommended that the department of public instruction go as far as possible toward reorganizing the state system of education on

the basis of the report. The new committee appointed by the state superintendent of public instruction to rewrite and reorganize the course of study called on me to write an extended outline course on social study. This outline, having been submitted, was adopted, save for the last two years, which had to give way to find place for civics and history. That course is essentially the one which appears in the January number of the *American Journal of Sociology*, and I believe is to be printed as a part of these proceedings.

The social study course is now in its second year in the schools of North Dakota. I sent out a questionnaire to county superintendents last September asking for information on the number of schools actually using the course, the difficulties encountered by the teachers with it, and for suggestions as to the advisability of preparing helps for teachers and pupils. About two-fifths of the counties replied. These I believe to be typical of the state as a whole. Ten of these counties used the course in some manner in schools ranging from a few up to one-half the number of schools in the county. Teachers found the course generally difficult because they had no preparation to teach the subject and because no appropriate helps exist. Letters received from teachers in my own county indicate that much good comes from this kind of teaching in the estimation of the teachers, especially where the teachers have appropriate training and experience. County superintendents and teachers alike advocate the preparation of helps and affirm that the course would thus be made generally available.

The showing made at the end of the first year of use may not appear very glowing but probably it is as good as we could expect. The course of study in question was adopted as an experiment. Neither the committee responsible for the authorizing of the course nor the author of the outline expected large results at once. All realized that the course calls for new outlook and preparation on the part of teachers and that at present but a very few could engineer the work successfully. Since a slow development was anticipated, there is no reason to pronounce the experiment a failure. Further, the movement in education at the present time is in the direction of some form of community study. The Chicago schools have put such a course into operation, although of a different kind from the one under consideration. Other communities are reaching out in this direction. The fact that the national sociological society is willing to give consideration to the subject marks an advance in this direction. It is most likely that the nation is going to move forward to the incorporation of social and community studies into its public-school system. It may not accept the North Dakota form. Experiment is likely to suggest great improvements. A co-ordination of several subjects, such as geography history, and civics, may be realized so that the social outlook and the organic view of things may be given the pupils.

It is likely that the one year's experience with this course is not far different in its results from what has been the experience in the beginning with each of the courses which have been given for so long. It certainly is fresh in our

minds that the introduction of agriculture and nature-study was attended by great vicissitudes. Even now those studies are but poorly adapted to the work of the elementary schools and the teachers find great difficulty in teaching them. Every new thing has to win its way into recognition and use. One of my respondent county superintendents bewails the fact that his teachers are not able to follow any one of the outline courses of the state course of study because they have not been trained specifically to do so. Such statements encourage us in the exercise of the virtue of patience.

REUBEN MCKITRICK, CEDAR FALLS, IOWA

I came to Cedar Falls two years ago. I have made trial of Carroll D. Wright's book in fall, spring, and summer sessions. I want to have a course in general sociology. Then I want to have a course in economic problems and one in social problems.

PAUL L. VOGT, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, OHIO

There is a normal department in our university in which sociology has been taught in a tentative way. We hope to have a regular course in that department before long.

E. M. VIOLETTE, KIRKSVILLE, MISSOURI

I am a teacher of history, not of sociology, but my president told me to come to this meeting to see what is being done with sociology. There has been a trial of it in my school, but as far as I know there is no formal course in sociology in any Missouri normal school.

(After some further discussion the Round Table voted to ask the American Sociological Society to appoint a committee to consider the relations of sociology to the training of teachers—the place it occupies at present both in the normal schools and in the universities, the place it ought to occupy, and the content of the course in normal schools. At the afternoon session of the Society a motion was adopted for the appointment of such a committee. Professor Albion W. Small, as acting president, appointed John M. Gillette, F. R. Clow, and Reuben McKitrick, the first to be chairman, and the second, secretary.)

"SOCIAL ASSIMILATION": AMERICA AND CHINA

CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON
University of Chicago

The phrase "social assimilation" has hardly come to have a precise and commonly accepted meaning; but it is sufficiently exact to indicate a field of observation and of critical interpretation of intercourse between members of groups, races, or nations. It is proposed in this paper to discuss a few of the phenomena of relations between Americans and persons in China; but no claim of completeness, adequacy, or authority is suggested. A statement of certain facts of common knowledge may furnish the starting-point of this brief study or hungry interrogation:

1. Since about 1840 trade enterprises, driven by powerful commercial interests, have been pushed in China, with Great Britain in the lead. Many British authors deny that there ever was an aggressive war to force the opium traffic on the Chinese, and that question need not be discussed here. But certain it is, and a matter of boast in our mother-country, that English gunpowder has opened ports and made commerce relatively secure in the Celestial Empire; and that Hongkong remains in the possession of the British government. The French and the Germans have planted their flags on the Continent and occupy fortified centers by force of arms and dread of using them. Under their protection, or in occasional alliance with these powers, the United States have helped to secure an "open door," through which very few of our traders have yet cared to pass with their wares. The statistics of trade between China and the various countries give us a more exact notion of the result up to this time.[1]

2. The political relations between China and the United States have steadily become closer. China does not yet belong fully in the group of nations which recognize and respect international law. China still submits to the decisions of foreign courts on her own soil

[1] Given in the *China Year Book*, 1913.

and accepts foreign tax-gatherers at the receipt of customs. The United States embassy at Peking lives in a fort protected by American soldiers, even in time of peace. This must be regarded as a transient situation. Certain it is that many Chinese public men secretly resent and detest the arrangement, and bide the time when a self-respecting treaty may be secured, and the position maintained by Japan. It is one source of friction and ill-concealed grudge. As the United States government was not so prominent as Great Britain in the aggressive military operations which placed China in this position, we do not suffer so much in their esteem and confidence.

3. Certain districts of China feel the painful pressure of population on the means of subsistence, even with a high rate of mortality; and they are seeking an outlet for the surplus in Burmah, the Malayan colonies, and elsewhere. They are energetic, industrious, shrewd, masterful, and successful. They are prosperous, even in Hongkong, under the British flag. Many are looking with longing toward California; some of them know of the efforts of Japan to secure a foothold on this continent; and millions would be ready to come over if there was any hope of having a two-acre farm. The treatment received by their pathfinders on the Pacific Coast has not helped us in our relations with the Chinese, whatever justification it may have had in the supposed necessity for self-defense. The problem of regulation, limitation, or prohibition of Chinese labor is not discussed here on its merits; it is alluded to as a factor in explanation of the difficulties in the way of assimilation of American culture.

4. On the other hand, the American people have done certain acts which are recorded to our credit, and which at banquets, where Chinese orators wish to toss us bouquets, serve for material in flattering addresses. They remind us that when in settlement of claims we were awarded indemnity for wrongs done our countrymen, we told them to keep the money; and they chose to invest its income in education; the "Indemnity College" near Peking is now sending us scores of young fellows, keen, bright, and brotherly. They do not altogether forget that in the last awful famine, when about two million people faced starvation, the Americans led in

organization of relief and contributed about 90 per cent of the foreign funds for mitigating the terrible misery. Yuan Shih-Kai has voiced the sentiment of millions of Chinese people when, before the visiting medical missionaries assembled in the wonderful capital, he manfully acknowledged the debt of his people to our own.

I do not propose to discuss that form of assimilation which springs from intermarriage, important as that subject is. Some day it may come to ask for practical action of some kind; but not now. No doubt we shall hear occasionally of instances of intermarriage, and in certain localities the number may be considerable. Some Chinese students and others have already expressed impatience on the subject. It does not seem worth while to indulge in speculation at present, for many reasons, and partly because the biological basis for the speculations are not yet sufficiently solid for valid conclusions on the racial effects of such unions.

The facts and consequences of exchange of ideas and sentiments seem to be most urgently in need of study for the present. We have here to do chiefly with deeper and more interior, personal phenomena than those of trade, conquest, politics, and international law: (1) What are some of the significant facts and tendencies in the interchange of ideals, sentiments, valuations, standards of character between Chinese and Americans? (2) What are some of the consequences of social intercourse in trade, institutions of education, medical service, and missionary contacts on the inner and intimate life and soul of the Chinese? (3) Does our study of these facts and their consequences throw any light on the probable future of this intercourse? (4) Can we derive from this study any light on the subject of our duty in the situation; whether we have any duty; what it is; how we may best meet the obligations involved? Is it desirable to make any effort to promote or hinder "assimilation," and if so, of what kind?

It is common to hear from well-informed writers that the Chinese are a "mystery" to Americans; that they are so peculiar that we can never understand them; so sly and deceptive that we

can never learn the real facts about them. Unquestionably there are both physical and psychical differences; for there are considerable tracts and caverns of our own being of which we have only dim and confused notions. Just as certainly there are shades and refinements of motive and taste, of belief and reverence in the Chinese, which must remain to us *terra incognita;* not to dwell upon the fact that in a population of 400,000,000 people, some children do not know their own fathers, and some misunderstandings may arise about contracts and land marks. At the same time certain chance personal observations and readings have convinced me that there are a few things in the Chinese that we can read off without a dictionary. For example: it is not difficult to see that the Chinese like to eat, and are willing to work hard for food. There is no mystery about the contents of the open fish tanks which the messengers of Canton carry around for their customers. The people shiver with cold, as we do. They occasionally die of typhoid, though Professor Ross finds them somewhat immune, as we are if we survive an attack. They will give a good deal to live; and some of them are ready to die if they must.

Readers of our newspapers should not find it too hard to understand Chinese politics. There is "squeeze" in Peking; "graft" in New York and in the administration of big railways. In China they do many things to "save their face"; while our looters of municipal funds grow indignant when accused and fill the air with the dust of counter-recriminations, meanwhile wearing, somewhat awkwardly, the assumed halo of sainthood and accepting from their partners a double coat of whitewash.

When the governor of Hangchow told me he lived on a salary of $300 a year and did not mention fees and perquisites, I knew from our experience with county sheriffs and treasurers what must follow. The fee system is rich soil for the roots of rascality in the state of Alabama and in Kwangtung Province. In Chicago our bosses tell us virtue is more robust!

But we may go deeper. In the ethical and poetical literature of China there are gems of purest ray serene. We need not be ashamed to welcome them into world-literature. Someone must have felt the inspiration of those noble sentiments; and there must

have been something which responded to them in a people who have cherished and revered these writings for many generations.

II

What are some of the consequences of contact between the Chinese and Americans? There are so few Americans in China, and they have been there so short a time, that their influence as yet touches comparatively few points; a few soldiers and marines; a few consuls in the most important cities; a few teachers in colleges and schools, private and public; a few medical and evangelizing missionaries; some traders of various grades of integrity and character. It would be impossible to describe all the consequences which have come from the occasional and limited contacts of our citizens with those of China; much less to give any numerical or true measure of the extent of these influences. Who can tell what the crop will be from seed buried temporarily under the sheet of winter snow? No one has yet set forth in more fascinating and picturesque phrase some of the manifest fruits of these relations than our own Professor Ross, of whose book on the *Changing Chinese* a high authority told me in Peking: "I have found some errors in little things; but in all the big things he is right."

One consequence is that China is seeking Western science and art; not all China, but the most prescient and influential persons. The example of Japan and the humiliating defeat which the big nation suffered at her hands have compelled a study of the causes. Recently the flood of Chinese students to Japan has been diminished and the number sent to Europe and America is increasing; while in government schools teachers from the West are installed in considerable numbers.

It may be easy to exaggerate the importance of these facts. The people of China are numerous and self-satisfied; proud of their ancient culture and achievements; and the means of communication are imperfect. The movement of ideas is obstructed by prejudice, ignorance, and custom. Corrupt politicians, there, as here, are suspicious of any change which threatens to curtail their power to loot and spoil. Reactions and revolutions must be expected; splendid promises and pitiful performances; delays and intrigue;

treacherous diplomacy and open defiance. All these obstacles will give the critics of China abundant food for gossip, and to aggressive powers excuses for armed intervention, especially when commercial interests, not always clean, appeal to the honor of their country's flag whenever railway or mining stocks decline and interest on bonds is difficult to collect.

In spite of these reactionary movements and these pessimistic prophecies, one does not need to draw from the spring of national optimism to justify a sober hope of the gradual transformation of Chinese ideals, ethics, education, diplomacy, commerce. There is a sound root and trunk to Chinese character; amazing industry; wonderful capacity; a persistence and solidarity of national life which has held together the peoples of many widely extended provinces for aeons. Already in particular instances we see what a Chinese man may become when, though still Chinese, he enriches his mind with the scientific and ethical ideas won by the Western world. What has happened in a few cases may become general —even universal.

III

What is the probable future of these relations? Enough has been said to indicate that some kind of contact is inevitable. It does not seem possible to tear down the wonderful Chinese wall and use the stones for a barrier along our Pacific Coast.

1. The American manufacturers have already begun to study the Chinese markets with keener interest. If British, German, and French traders are eager to have a share in the enterprises of mining, building railways and bridges, selling coal oil, textile machinery, electric light and power companies, cotton and silk mills, etc., then our Americans of energy and vision are certain to seek a share, whenever the demands of the home market are not adequate. China has many articles of export which we want.

For economic reasons it does not seem probable that we can avoid closer contact.

2. Our methods of dealing with immigration are a constant insult to the pride of all Orientals. They seem willing to accept laws of exclusion based on economic grounds, but feel keenly that

discrimination in favor of European laborers must be protested against with all the force of their national feeling. This sentiment is sure to grow and must be reckoned with. The discrimination against the Chinese on grounds of race will continue to rankle in the oriental soul and the hatred it induces will wait only the moment of our weakness to find expression.

3. As a member of the group of nations which recognize the ethical principles of international law we cannot avoid our share of responsibility for steadily insisting on those principles in the East This means that our diplomacy must penetrate the sentiments customs, administration, and legislation of China; for China cannot be fully admitted to the privileges of the international law group of nations while its revenue system remains mediaeval, its criminal law and procedure archaic, its central government despotic and feeble, its local administration corrupt and oppressive.

4. We have gone too far in our voluntary efforts to promote science and education in the East to retreat unless compelled by insurmountable obstacles.

5. Without discussing the dogmas or beliefs of missionaries, or the wisdom and sanity of some of their purposes, no interpretation of the situation is complete without taking missionary efforts into account. Science and education are mediated chiefly by missionaries, including the Y.M.C.A. Recent history shows that the capacity for martyrdom has not been exhausted. The beliefs which actuate missionaries are of the stuff which robs death, not of its terrors, but of its inhibiting power. The governments might remove their protection from these enthusiasts and enough of them would remain to keep the bond between the peoples alive. Furthermore, there are thousands of Chinese who also are ready to die for this faith; and thousands of them who are not converts who have seen enough of our missions and schools to desire their continuance.

IV

Have Americans any obligations of duty to China? We may remind ourselves of the hard-won achievement of social science, the discovery that the ascent of man is no longer left to the control of natural selection and blind instinct. Even in the ethics and politics

of Plato and Aristotle the aims of general welfare became motives to concerted volition. The negative policy of *laissez faire* is yielding to the positive and constructive policy of scientific investigation and co-operative effort to promote the common good. Nations are determined to have something to say about their own future to fate and to despots.

The word "ought" in social science begins to make conquest of the word "must," which is the last word of nature sciences. And the conduct which ought to be is no longer determined by some vague appeal to "justice," "natural law," "law of nations," but by the largest and most exact possible array of facts in the relations of conditions and consequences to welfare. In this vast and complex calculation of consequences, certain or probable, economic and physical welfare must take no more than a fair and reasonable place at the banquet of life; the higher ends of personality, to which wealth and health are, in the phrase of Carlyle, mere "preliminary items," are coming to be counted in social science as realities. Furthermore, we are surely passing beyond the political ethics of Machiavelli, which helped temporarily to build nations, and which, having achieved its end, should be laid away in the historical museum with other dried and dead specimens. Even Bismarck is becoming obsolete. That calculation of social science which omits the highest form of welfare of the 400,000,000 people of China deserves scant notice. The facts are too vast to ignore. The exploitation theory of colonization may sometimes still be followed by private greed, but it is solemnly disowned in politics and diplomacy. The Belgian infamies on the Congo, and the treatment of Indian laborers in South Africa, only serve to evoke cries of horror and reprobation among civilized peoples; they would not be tolerated in China.

The argument of this brief and inadequate statement has for its issue these demands of social morality:

Contact with China is inevitable. Intercourse with the Chinese people through trade, education, travel, missions, and diplomacy must grow. The consequences of this increasing intercourse must be felt in all the interests of our nation and of mankind. The movement, which is irresistible, requires for its rational direction

all the resources of social science to master and present the entire causal series of phenomena, and so present them that the federation of the world can be guided on the way of justice, culture, fair dealing, elevation of the whole human race.

It is just the distinction of true science that it makes common knowledge more systematic and complete; that it ignores the selfish considerations, prejudices, and national pride which conceal the merits and rights of strangers and exaggerate the importance of the interests which are near; that it takes into account all elements which may help to visualize and comprehend the entire problem; and thus it brings to law, diplomacy, commerce, education, philanthropy, and religion that mastery of knowledge which illuminates the progress of mankind on its royal highway to ever-increasing wisdom, beauty, justice, brotherhood, and intimations of endless hope and striving.

ASSIMILATION IN THE PHILIPPINES, AS INTERPRETED IN TERMS OF ASSIMILATION IN AMERICA

ALBERT ERNEST JENKS
University of Minnesota

Assimilation is psychic, as distinguished from amalgamation which is physical and founded on the biological fact resulting in miscegenation. So assimilation is intellectual and emotional; fundamentally it is emotional. Van Dyke suggests that, as assimilation progresses, it produces certain resemblances between individuals or ethnic groups, followed by developing likenesses. The likenesses become increasingly persistent until at last identity results; then and only then is assimilation complete. Only when the individuals or ethnic groups are emotionally dead to all their varied past, and are all responsive solely to the conditions of the present are they an assimilated people.

On the occasion of the recent Balkan War many thousand Greeks from America poured into the Grecian army, while scarcely one entered our volunteer army in the recent Spanish-American War; the Greeks in America are not yet assimilated. A few years ago during the threatening rupture between Norway and Sweden, foreign-born Minnesota Swedes sent word to the king of Sweden that they would gladly bear arms in defense of their Motherland—but they hastened to add that they would as quickly bear arms for America, their mother by adoption. The foreign-born Scandinavians in Minnesota are rapidly assimilated.

Probably the power of assimilation is the most outstanding and distinguishing characteristic of American social life of today. So accustomed to it are we that at first thought we might take it for granted as occurring everywhere and at all times. To do so is to proclaim our nearsighted vision. Hon. James Bryce wrote from the city of Tiflis, Caucasus, in 1875, Tiflis is

> a human melting-pot, a city of contrasts and mixtures, into which elements have been poured from half Europe and Asia, and in which they as yet show no

signs of combining. The most interesting thing about it is the city itself, the strange mixture of so many races, tongues, religions, customs. Its character lies in the fact that it has no character, but ever so many different ones. Here all these people live side by side, buying and selling and working for hire, yet never coming into any closer union, remaining indifferent to one another, with neither love nor hate nor ambition, peaceably obeying a government of strangers who conquered them without resistance and retain them without effort, and held together by no bond but its existence. Of national life or numerical life there is not the first faint glimmer.

Thirty-five years later Mr. William E. Curtis wrote from Tiflis that

what Mr. Bryce said of Tiflis is equally true today. Perhaps it is even more true today than it was then because of the increase of population.

It is now substantially 850 years since the last extensive ethnic flood deluged Great Britain. Yet it is only within the confines of England that assimilation has anywhere nearly completed its process. Assimilation operates more rapidly than amalgamation in England, but outside England, as in Ireland and Scotland, assimilation with the English lags far behind its goal.

In America assimilation did not always characterize our people. In the Atlantic coast-wise colonies it was practically unknown. When the peoples of the diverse coast-wise groups filtered through the mountains westward the earlier individualistic ideas and ideals which had repeatedly caused splits in those groups along the coast gave way before the dominant interests of the new westward movement. Americanisms then began to form the American character.

America possesses an unprecedented ability of assimilation. To what condition or conditions is it due? In speaking of assimilation Münsterberg says:

America's whole success in that direction is determined by its geographical and economic situation, but not by its form of government (*American Traits*, p. 187).

In 1908 Hon. Joaquim Nabuco, ambassador of Brazil to the United States, said:

It is not patriotism that conquers immigration. Through our intercourse with you we see what it is that conquers it. You owe your unparalleled success, as an immigration country, first of all to your political spirit. . . . .

The American political spirit is a combination of the spirit of individual liberty with the spirit of equality. Liberty alone would not convert the immigrant into a new citizen. . . . . Equality is a more powerful agent. . . . . It is the progress of your country, the place it has made for itself in the world, that helps with national pride the spirit of liberty and equality in winning over to you the millions of immigrants who try life in America (*The Approach of the Two Americas*, p. 7).

The two authors quoted are typical of the many; they disagree completely and diametrically as to the cause of American assimilation. Let us say that each in his positive statement, but not in his negative one, is partially correct. Assimilation in America is a complex of conditions, among which are the following—numbered for the sake of convenience and not to indicate relativity:

1. *Volition on the part of the person to be assimilated.*—Practically all immigrant aliens who have come to America, except the Chinese and Japanese, and some of the southeastern Europeans, especially Slavs and Italians, have come to America determined to become Americans. They deliberately "burned their bridges [of historic and hereditary emotions] behind them." Assimilation of a person against his will is probably impossible; assimilation is immeasurably rapid when one's chiefest desire is to be considered, at the earliest possible moment, a typical citizen of the country of his adoption.

2. *The English language as the common means of intercommunication.*—Probably the rapidity with which our spoken language is learned by immigrants is, next to assimilation itself, the most striking fact of American social life.

The English spoken language is memorable. Its sledge-hammer blows delivered as short Anglo-Saxon words or as longer words with stressed syllables of harsh consonantal sounds seem to have an advantage all over the world today. One can trade in the markets on navigable waters today more easily in the English language than in any other. The harsh brutality of the English spoken language makes it easy to remember—actually difficult to forget. Such a hold does its vigor get on the young, even foreign-born, children of our immigrants that their mother-tongue becomes a thing despised and to be forgotten. Alexander Francis, the Britisher, favorably contrasts the vitality and freshness of the

English spoken in America with "the anaemic refinement of speech in which Englishmen are apt to take pride."

The immigrants who learn in the streets or the school the use and meaning of such phrases as "play the game," "buck up," "a square deal," "be a good fellow," "put it over," etc., are bound to have their motives and emotions molded toward the fundamental ideal of American democracy—the ideal of an equal opportunity for each person to develop himself as far as he has capacity, so long as he does not interfere with every other person's equal right so to do. The constant use of fresh, virile language helps to make vigorous, alert, resourceful citizens of repressed subjects.

3. *Common education.*—Our compulsory attendance at school until the age of fourteen years, and the habit of newspaper reading have contributed largely to produce what Bryce says is a higher level of general education than exists elsewhere. Couple this condition with the present-day results of a "free press" and "free speech," and an educated public opinion results which becomes exhilarating ozone to the low-toned nerves of our immigrants. The necessary years in our primary and intermediate schools are very important, also, in furnishing the impressionable child with practical experiences of fundamental democracy with its individual independence and the leveling fact of childhood equality. The bully and the snob do not last long in the average primary and intermediate grades of our public schools; they become democratic, or enter private schools.

4. *Common religion.*—Americans have had so many things "in common," or, to put it in another way, so very few things not in common, that the disadvantages of diverse religions within a single nation are difficult to realize. America is essentially Christian, and the religionist finds scant cause for belief in serious friction even in closest scrutiny of the distant horizon. The protracted and deadly wars and persecutions of Europe within the so-called Christian faiths and between Christianity and Mohammedanism help us to see more clearly the assimilating factor of our common Christianity. There are lines of religious cleavage in America, to be sure, but the fundamental ideal of democracy is fast becoming at home in the sphere of religious belief, practice, and life, as

it is in the sphere of business, government, social intercourse, and education.

5. *Common attainable aspirations.*—With the exception of relatively small numbers of persons who come to America to escape political or religious pressure, our immigrants at all times belong to the class which with high hope and great courage come, after years of hard sacrifice, to seek an expectant fortune. America is still *el Dorado* for most immigrants. Very few among them do not rise in the social scale after coming to America—very few fail to find a "fortune," that is, it is common for our immigrants to have aspirations which are reasonably attainable. Success in one's undertaking engenders loyalty to the cause. Successful immigrants are loyal American boosters.

6. *Citizenship.*—I used to think the ballot should not be given to any person not born in the United States. I now believe one of the most important causes of America's success in assimilating her vast numbers of immigrants is citizenship with its duties and privileges. Every man knows that in time he may become a part of that young, successful nation to which he has come. And though voters are herded in places at times, an immigrant citizen or prospective citizen is much more likely to be alert and responsive to American conditions than an alien would be in the country he had adopted but which would not reciprocate. Undoubtedly our immigrants somewhat modify Americanisms; undoubtedly, also, our potent Americanisms assimilate almost completely our immigrants as citizens. Just what the percentage of gain in assimilation is when our immigrants become citizens over what it would be if they remained aliens is, of course, only conjectural. But, in spite of the evils of herded voters, I do not favor making citizenship more difficult to secure than now. A horse bought on trial is generally criticized and his "good points" often minimized; a horse bought outright is defended, and his weaknesses, though discovered, are often minimized or cured. It makes a great deal of difference in the loyalty of most men whether a horse or a country "belongs."

7. *Physical and human environment.*—There is no question about the tonic effect of American climate. The sudden drops in

temperature over most of the area of the United States produce in a wholesale way the therapeutic effect frequently sought and artificially induced at the instance of physicians for certain individuals who need "toning up." Americans are usually enthusiastic about the climate of their vicinity, whether they live in Washington, D.C., with its hot humid blanket of summer; or in Arizona with its summer days registering 120° in the shade; or in the interior valleys of California with their dripping and penetrating land-fogs in winter; or in Dakota with its blinding, often fatal, blizzards. In all those areas there are compensating conditions. American climate lacks deadening monotony. It has the quickening spice of variety.

The climate of America, and the magical resources of her vast domain, are irresistible in producing a new type of man. He is recognized the world over. He is restless, tense, vigorous, resourceful, confident, courageous, ready, and generous, with the habit of success.

It would be possible, probably, to exaggerate the influence of ethnic groups in America in the assimilation of our immigrants and yet not exaggerate the social influence. However, I wish to speak briefly of the ethnic group. George Burton Adams called attention to this matter as early as 1897. He said:

> It is probable that the larger part of those [immigrants] who appear in our census reports as of foreign parentage are foreign in no proper sense. They are an important part of our Americanizing force. As we know by daily observation, the Americanized foreigner is a powerful aid to us in assimilating the recent foreigner (*Civilization during the Middle Ages*, p. 30).

Immigrants most commonly find homes in the vicinity of their friends and relatives who have preceded them to America. There the process of transformation—the ruthless slaying of the past and the careful implanting and nurture of the present—is the absorbing interest. This making of Americans often reaches prospective immigrants in their old homes. A foreign-born Minnesota woman wrote her friend who was about to migrate from Europe to America, "Buy yourself a hat in New York. Don't you dare get off the train in Minneapolis with a shawl over your head." So the effort is often made by our immigrants at once to resemble the Americans among whom they are to live.

The chief factors of assimilation in America have been named. They are: environment, citizenship, aspirations, religion, English language, and volition. What is meant by assimilation in the Philippine Islands? Does it mean assimilation of the Filipinos by Americans in the Islands, or does it mean the making of a homogeneous Philippine people out of the diverse ethnic and cultural groups now there?

I start with the assumption that knowledge of the two factors, environment and volition, is sufficient to convince one that the handful of Americans in the Philippines can never, against the Filipino's will, make typical Americans of the Filipinos living in the Philippine Islands. Today it is known that the environment in time perfects its own type of man. The American has introduced into the Philippines many new artificial environmental conditions, but the permanent factor of natural environment will eventually override all artificial environment which is not permanent. Since the Philippine Archipelago lies entirely within the tropics, and, since 7,000,000 of the 8,000,000 Filipinos live in the tropical lowlands (rather than in the more temperate highlands), it will not be possible for the Filipinos to come under the influence of such stimulating temperate-zone environment as exists in the United States. The Filipinos must remain a tropical people.

The phrase, "Assimilation in the Philippines," must mean the making of a homogeneous people out of the diverse groups in the Archipelago. I shall consider the making of that people under the influence of the artificial environment introduced by the American.

In the Philippines today under the influence of Americanisms are found beginning to operate the same factors that so dominantly operate in American assimilation. With no attempt to focus attention solely on the seven factors of assimilation named above I shall present the important conditions making for assimilation in the Philippines and present them under the same headings.

1. *Volition.*—It is impossible to know the exact desire of the people in the Philippines toward the adoption of Americanisms, though there is little reason to doubt the statement that an overwhelming vote against the American would be cast if the question was one of continued occupation of the Islands by America.

That the readers may have clearly in mind the peoples of the Archipelago, they will be presented briefly under this section, and characterized in terms of volition. There are about 8,000,000 natives in the Archipelago. They are divided into four distinct culture groups. First, the 7,000,000 christianized people, composed of eight dialect groups[1] (commonly called tribes). These groups occupy solely the coastal lowlands, except the Cagayan group whose home is from the coast of Northern Luzon far up the Cayagan River. All, except the Visayan group, live in the island of Luzon; all, except the Tagalog group which centers about Manila, may roughly be located by provinces which share their names. The Visayan peoples occupy the central islands lying between the two large islands of Luzon on the north and Mindanao on the south.

These various groups, christianized by the Spaniards, are in numbers, culture, and importance the Filipinos *par excellence*. They had no common desire toward the Spaniard expressed in common concerted action, though the various local insurrections proclaim that most of the groups felt and resented the pressure of Spanish treatment. The Archipelago was discovered by Magellan in 1521. Spanish domination really began in 1571. The following insurrections have been recorded against Spain: 1588, 1591–92, 1649, 1660, 1750–1827 by Visayans in Bohol, 1762–63 by three separate groups independently, 1823, 1841, 1872, 1896–98. This last insurrection was the one in operation at the time Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet, May 1, 1898. It was a Tagalog insurrection, and the Tagalog people believed that the American navy and army helped them throw off the Spanish oppression so they might be independent. When they discovered that the American was going to remain there occurred the most serious insurrection in Philippine history—the one begun against America February 4, 1899, and ending April 20, 1902. Within the next year began the very stubborn insurrection of the Visayan people of Samar and Leyte which continued for some three years.

All these insurrections were of the nature of defense, none were aggressively offensive. Not one of the insurrections was sup-

[1] Christianized groups: Bikol, Cagayan or Ibanag, Ilokano, Pampanga, Pangasanan, Tagalog, Visayan or Bisayan, and Zambal. Besides these eight there are three small interior towns of Gaddan people in Central Luzon—perhaps 5,000 persons.

ported by even all of the people of a single dialect group—to say nothing of all the people of two or more of the eight christianized groups uniting against Spain or America at the same time. In 1809 the Napoleonic crisis in Spain caused her to grant the Filipinos the right of two deputies to the cortes. In 1812 Spain proclaimed a new constitution, and this allowed the Filipinos to send about 40 deputies; only three or four were usually sent however. In 1814 the constitution was revoked—even this did not awaken united opposition in the Philippines. The Ilokanos of Ilokos Norte at once revolted, but they were all. Each insurrection, however, may truly be said to have been the result of a determined effort on the part of some local group to resist a common pressure, but at no time was there an expression of the consciousness of common interest or of the value of concerted action.

The second large culture group is the "Moro." These people are the five Mohammedan tribes[1] which occupy all the coastal area of Southern and Western Mindanao, and all the other islands of the Archipelago to the southwest including the southern coast of Palawan. They were never conquered by the Spaniards, and are breaking out against the Americans a number of times each year now. In their historic scourges over the Visayan Islands and even to the northern coast of Luzon villages from two or more of the five tribes sometimes united, though co-operation among all the tribes never occurred, nor did all the people of even a single tribe appear ever to have joined in such an expedition. The Moros were fast conquering the Archipelago when the Spaniards established themselves in Manila in 1571—Manila itself being in their hands. I do not know a man who is intimately acquainted with the Moros who believes the living adults will ever be assimilated by the American or christianized Filipino ideals.

If America was ever justified in closing her doors against an alien people, she is justified in closing the Philippine Islands against the Arab, because it was he who, as a trader, brought Mohammedanism to the five pagan tribes now Mohammedanized, and it is still the straggling Arab who brings it and keeps it alive in the Archipelago. With no more Mohammedanism introduced,

[1] The Moro peoples are: Lanao, Magindanao, Samal, Sulu, and Yakan. They number about 300,000 persons.

with the present generation dead, there is good reason to believe that the cause of the unabated fierce enmity of the Moros toward all other peoples in the Philippines would soon cease. So long as Mohammedanism continues assimilation will be impossible, because the Mohammedan will not be assimilated with the Christian.

The third group is the pagan Malayan. These people are brothers of the Moros who were pagans Mohammedanized, and brothers of the christianized groups who were pagans brought under the influence of Spain. They number about 700,000 persons in a score of tribes occupying all of Mindanao, except the coastal areas held by the Moros, and occupying the greater part of Northern Luzon. They are also found in most of Palawan and Mindoro, and in the mountainous interiors of many other islands where the Spaniards did not reach them.

Among many of these peoples I believe an overwhelming vote in favor of American control as against christianized Filipino, and, certainly, against Moro control would be cast if such a vote were taken. This is the view of many men who know them well. It must be said that so far the treatment of natives of the Philippines by other natives of a higher grade of culture has not been benevolent. And the pagans of Northern Luzon remember well the treatment they received at the hands of the *insurrectos* (mainly Tagalog people, under Aguinaldo) who passed through their country in 1900–1901. The fairest treatment, their greatest peace, and prosperity they have had under American control. So far as they know what Americanisms mean, it is believed they would wish them to be developed. I have no knowledge that they desire assimilation with the christianized culture of their kin. They have always resisted it, and the christianized groups had a wholesome fear and deferential respect for the pagan hillman. The development of Americanisms among these pagans, which is going on rapidly now, will draw them and the christianized Filipinos together by virtue of cultural similarities.

The fourth group is the Negrito. These people are a remnant of aborigines numbering some 25,000, who have not culture enough to possess clear or persistent desires toward assimilation with any other culture. They must be ignored in this discussion.

Besides these four groups of Filipinos there are Chinese, probably less than 100,000, and Japanese, probably some less than 200,000, all of whom will need to be reckoned with in the making of a united people in the Philippines. What the Japanese desire no man can say—at least no man can believe all that is said. As to the Chinese, it does not much matter what they themselves desire; but what their descendants desire will go far toward answering the whole question of the Filipino's volition toward assimilation, because they are *the* Filipinos. To be specific: During the latter days of my residence in the Islands in 1905 Governor-General Wright one day told me that he had recently personally received from one of the most distinguished Filipinos of the time, and a member of the Insular Civil Commission, the statement "that there was not a single prominent and dominant family among the christianized Filipinos which did not possess Chinese blood." The voice and the will of the Filipinos today is the voice and the will of these brainy, industrious, rapidly developing men whose judgment in time the world is bound to respect. Today I do not believe the wisest among them are in a position to agree on a reasonably permanent desire in the present problem.

2. *English language.*—First it should be noted that though the groups of people christianized by the Spaniards were all Malayan, yet the dialects of the eight groups were so different that intercommunication was next to impossible. In 1590 a council of Friars decided to teach each dialect group of natives to read and write its own dialect instead of Spanish—thus intensifying the dialect differences. During the governorship of Anda (1770–76), a royal decree was issued that Spanish should be taught the Filipinos instead of their own dialects. In spite of that fact it was said that only 5 per cent of the Filipinos could read or write Spanish at the time of American occupation. A Manila experience may serve to illustrate this lack of a common means of intercommunication. One evening in 1903 I was riding my horse in company with Judge D. R. Williams in the eastern outskirts of Manila when we came upon a large crowd of people in the street watching a man put a struggling woman into a covered caretilla. He bundled her over the tail-board, climbed in after her while the driver of the cart

whipped up the horse, and they disappeared in the dusk down the road. We tried for some time to learn the cause of the, to us, unique spectacle, but no one in the crowd could understand either my "pidgeon-Spanish" or the Judge's Castilian. At last someone brought up a crippled old man who could talk with us; he had been many years a house servant in a Spanish family. Through him we learned that "some man was stealing a woman"—that was all! This was in the outskirts of Manila, the capital of the Archipelago where Spanish influence was at its highest and where it had existed since 1571.

Today the English language has been acquired so extensively by means of the primary schools which exists in all provinces, and by high schools, normal schools, and trade schools that in June, 1910, the University of the Philippines was opened to take care of the numbers of English-speaking students who demanded a college training. In 1912 the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs said that at least 3,000,000 Filipinos have had instruction in English in the public schools of the Philippines. There are now in the neighborhood of 700,000 pupils enrolled annually in these schools. This number is about one-third of the population of school age.

The English language has gone more widely over the Islands, however, than simply within the schoolroom. That English words are quickly ingrafted into the Filipino's vocabulary was forced home upon the American in the Islands during early days of American occupation. Several times we found a few words of the American brand of profanity to be the only English spoken by Filipinos. The use of such memorable English was at times naïve and startling. I shall not forget the surprise I experienced on a beautiful October morning in 1902 when, getting an early start on a hike in the Upper Cagayan Valley, I met a smiling Cagayan belle whose trail crossed mine on stones over a shallow stream. She came gliding barefoot down the stony bank balancing a load of fruit on her head; and in her "best" English, as a sincere salutation, greeted me with the most cheery and pleasant-voiced American profanity I have ever heard.

Today one may go everywhere in the Archipelago among the 7,000,000 christianized Filipinos and find fifty or more natives in

each province familiar with high-school English, and on every hand there are children talking English on the streets. The English language is a common means of communication between the diverse dialect groups in the Islands such as the Spanish language had not become after more than 350 years of occupation, and such as the different Filipino dialects could not become. The government official last quoted said on this matter in 1912: "The hope of developing any real idea of nationality among the Filipino peoples of the future lies more probably in the spread of a common language than in any other one thing, and English offers the only hope to be raised in this respect." English, then, will be an important assimilating factor in the Philippine Islands, provided its growth continues as at present for a couple of generations more. Since January 1, 1913, English has been the official language even of the courts of the Archipelago.

3. *Common education.*—During the Spanish régime the christianized Filipinos were well taught in school, social life, and by example that physical work was undignified. The ideal and ambition of the youth of Manila during the first six or eight years of American occupation was to learn enough English so he could use a pen in a government office, wear pointed patent-leather American shoes, a black oven of a derby hat, clothing of American cut, and be considered an *elegante*, a Spanish dude.

Probably the most important fact developed by American education in the Islands is that the above view of life is false for a modern developing nation. Even the acquisition of the English language is probably of secondary importance to the development of moral fiber, physical strength, and general toning up in health and manhood through a man's earnest effort to earn his bread in the sweat of his brow—and to be proud of the sweat as well as of the abundant bread.

When the native teacher was first started in the American public schools it was the common thing for a servant to follow the dapper young teacher from his home to the school in order to carry his master's book. It was almost impossible to get young men to enter the first school of telegraphy established by the Americans. The Trades School languished for a long time because

no one wanted to learn to work. Now these things have greatly changed.

> Every boy and girl in every primary school throughout the Philippines spends a considerable portion of each school day in work with his hands. In every manual exercise he is engaged in making some article of real value, either for use or ornament in his own home, or for sale. . . . . A half-finished article, or a poorly finished article, is not acceptable; the work must be well done, completely done, and done to a definite purpose. . . . . In every case the lessons of patience, perseverence, and honest work are drilled into the fiber of the child's mind until they become essential features of character.

Thus wrote Frank R. White, the late director of education, in 1911. Of another aspect of the education Mr. White wrote the same year as follows:

> The model young man of earlier days was spotlessly clad; his occupations were sedentary, calling for no physical exertion and permitting of no soiling of linen or rumpling of personal composure. For physical exercise, it was proper to march seriously in school processions and take the evening air; and how much more rigidly were the standards of outward propriety enforced with respect to the young woman of the country! But now this new spirit of athletic interest has swept in upon the boys and girls with a force that is actually revolutionary, and with it come *new standards, new ideals of conduct, and, what is far more important, new ideals of character. These sports put red blood into the veins, new energy into body and mind, and establish new ideas of life's purpose and value.* For what boy can be satisfied with a dawdling, idle, careless, purposeless existence, if, for even a season or two, he has experienced the stirring discipline of public censure and public applause in hard athletic battles? Application, perseverance, and fair play may be words unfamiliar to such a boy, but he has learned the lessons which they represent and they will stay with him longer than any maxim learned from a book.

Today a common education is under way which will not only tend to add strong muscle, clear brain, and sterling character to the Filipino, but will produce abundantly the economic resources of life, enabling the people to satisfy an ever-increasing number of wants. Thus is being laid the foundation for a general rise in social status, a knowledge that culture is based on material prosperity and well-being, and an ambition in all men for an individually larger part in the common interests of the Islands.

Filipinos used to say that the Philippines contained a class of citizens which knew how to govern, and a class which knew how to obey. I believe history belies both statements. The new common

education in time will tend to produce a Filipino people which knows how to govern itself and how to obey its own laws. Then and only then will they be approaching assimilation.

4. *Common religion.*—There is no reason to doubt the statement that Christianity introduced by the Jesuits and the several orders of Friars was the most important assimilation factor in the Philippines in pre-American times. It operated in two ways. It brought a common economic culture to a remarkably uniform level among the eight dialect groups it converted from paganism. And, in its later harshness, as expressed by various religious orders, it assisted greatly in uniting the people against the church; several of the insurrections against Spain were really insurrections against the strangle-hold of the church.

Christianity still operates as an assimilating factor, and it is more important than before. The church orders which had so often been distrusted, and had irritated so many of the Filipinos, are gone forever, and an American archbishop is at the head of the Roman Catholic church. American Protestants are working among the christianized and pagan groups, and they have wisely divided the field, except urban residence centers of Americans, among the several different denominations—thus largely avoiding the probable confusion of the people. Paganism will not be more than a temporary check to the otherwise successful operation of Christianity as an assimilation factor. Mohammedanism apparently will be a permanent check; it is believed that Mohammedanism will be an unassimilable religion. A solution of the difficulty has been previously suggested.

5. *Common attainable aspirations.*—The most common aspiration in the Philippines now is for knowledge of the English language. Chinese, Japanese, pagan, Mohammedan, and christianized Filipinos eagerly strive to learn the language. This aspiration will be attainable for the youth as soon as sufficient revenue is available so that the remaining two-thirds of the children may be given instruction. It seems a reasonable and attainable aspiration. The next most common aspiration is that, shared probably by all christianized Filipinos, of an ever-increasing participation in the governmental control of the Archipelago. This aspiration is being attained in a magically short time; the frequent fear that it is too

short will probably be retained by the world until lapse of time proves, if it does so prove, that stages of culture may now and then be taken as a hurdle. The next most common aspiration is probably that for a Philippine protectorate under the United States; and the next, probably, is that for an out-and-out national independence. These two are not shared by all christianized peoples, and their corollary, that of a nation composed of all the diverse groups in the Archipelago, is not shared by Moros or pagans.

All these aspirations will assist the assimilation process just so far as they are shared by the diverse peoples.

6. *Citizenship*.—It should be clear by this time that the peoples of the Philippines are not of homogeneous culture. In this section attention will be placed upon the two classes of christianized Filipinos as they existed at the time of American occupation. Those classes should be defined not as "the class which knew how to govern and the class which knew how to obey," but as the class with wealth and superior culture, with Chinese and often European blood, which, because of its innate superiority, aspired to make itself the governing body of the Archipelago; and the other class, composed of some 95 per cent of the christianized people, which naturally took leadership from its superiors, and was so uncultured that it could not compete in any way except in numbers with those same superiors.

That the desired freedom from Spanish control would have brought any further duties and privileges of citizenship to this second class of Filipinos no one who has lived in the Philippines believes. The withdrawal of Spain from the Islands would have meant no shifting or lightening of the burden from the second class, but only a change of the masters who would place the burden. That the leaders of the last insurrection against Spain desired simply to make such a change of masters, that, at the time, the conception they had of citizenship was still mediaeval—a copy of Spanish Middle-Ages method—is seen in the following entry in the diary of Aguinaldo's physician made only one week before the capture of that leader:

> After supper the honorable President [Aguinaldo] in conversation with B., V., and Lieutenant Carasco, told them that as soon as independence of the country was declared he would give each one of them an amount of land

equal to what he himself will take for the future of his own family, that is, he will give each one of the three gentlemen 13,500 acres of land as a recompense for their work.

Thus did the freebooters divide spoils among their henchmen; the acres of modern nations belong to the citizens, not to the "President."

In my judgment the work of assimilation in the Philippines will be slowest right here. Because of the relative fewness of the pagans, Moros, Negritos, Chinese, and Japanese, let us ignore them in this section—though the actual political problem cannot be solved by such a simple way of elimination. There are left the two classes, the superior and natural leaders, and the natural followers. Those leaders have an inherited superiority which has been enhanced by culture. Some of those leaders (what percentage I make no pretense of even guessing) know that national prosperity cannot endure in competition with modern nations unless the majority of the people have, as individuals, an intelligent conception of their privileges, responsibilities, and duties as members of that nation. Some of those leaders have no such conception; they may never have it—natural aristocrats exist in all cultures, as do natural democrats.

There is the other class, the majority class; they are the problem. They must be educated away from more than 350 years of quasi-peonage, must be taught to speak, and to reason, and to demand and get their rights as citizens among those who have been so long their superiors. More than that, they must learn the hard lesson that rights entail duties and responsibilities. While making all this development they must get economic independence due to individual training and honest efficient toil. To accomplish all this against their natural inertia of race, and the inertia of social and physical environment is not a task that can be completed by the year 1921, or, it seems to some well-informed and not altogether vicious Americans, not within less than the lifetime of two generations of men developing under favorable conditions.

7. *Physical and human environment.*—The Philippine Archipelago stretches for fifteen degrees through the tropics, and though there are about 3,000 islands, they are all geographically, climati-

cally, culturally, and ethnically more interrelated than any of them are to any other land areas. The physical environment should make for assimilation.

However, history has not recorded a case of a tropical people with a tropical environment such as the christianized Filipinos live in that of its own initiative has attained a relatively high level of culture. Such culture must have a foundation of material well-being which is maintained by perpetual toil by a majority of the people. Probably the chief reason for this backwardness is because people naturally do not long work hard in such an environment. Again, no stable democratic government has flourished in such a tropical environment, to say nothing of such a government having originated there. Perhaps the chief reason is found in the fact that only as conditions favor the majority of the people will the naturally superior few relinquish their grip on authority over the many. Tropical conditions seem never to favor the majority of a people, but only the most gifted few.

It seems natural, then, to expect that tendencies toward democracy, if found in lowland tropics, are due to alien introduction, and that they would flourish only under artificially induced conditions. In other words, though one might not be surprised to find a lowland tropical people assimilated enough to attempt to throw off a foreign yoke, he would not, in the present world-stage of the development of popular government, expect such a people to initiate and perpetuate a stable democracy.

The problem of assimilation in the Philippines, so far as the human environment is concerned, is practically nil. All the Filipinos, except a few thousand Negritos, are Malayan. There are the Japanese and the Chinese, but the latter with few exceptions marry Filipino wives and raise Filipino children. So that the only true aliens there are the Japanese, who may or may not amalgamate, and the few thousand Americans and Europeans whose future in the Archipelago is hemmed closely about the laws deliberately made by the Americans to preserve "the Philippines for the Filipinos." Everything ethnically should favor assimilation. The human hindrances are cultural; they are largely religious and governmental.

CONCLUSION

Continued assimilation in the Philippines is problematic. I see no reason for believing that assimilation in the Philippines would carry far if the implanting of Americanisms there should now cease. That they would cease today upon the withdrawal of America, even under guaranty of Philippine national independence by the powers or the establishment of an ordinary protectorate by the United States, is evident to those who know the present status of cultural conditions in the Archipelago. There is naturally little unanimity in matters of volition, language, education, aspirations, religion, or in equipment for citizenship. There is very uniform natural and ethnic environment, but these alone cannot, as has been proved by the past, overcome the cultural conditions that are now quite natural to the several groups of people.

I do see reason for believing that continuation of the American policy in the Philippines for at least two generations more will result in a marked degree of assimilation. As has been said, the natural and ethnic environment is favorable. The English language by that time would have furnished a well-nigh universal means of oral and written intercommunication. A relatively high level of education would have become common, carrying with it, not simply facts of modern culture, but a developing economic sense and ideals of physical, mental, and moral health—all of which would greatly raise the social level of the majority of the people. The religious differences would not be greater than now, and they could be minimized. A people so developing would have, on the one hand, ever loftier aspirations for one another, and, on the other hand, an ever fuller expression of citizenship as those aspirations were realized. If a young and fecund people, such as the Filipinos most certainly are, is given sufficient tutelage in the fundamental principles of democracy, I see no reason to doubt that it can profit by it. Further, I see no reason to question that after such tutelage the factors of assimilation will have so far operated that the Filipinos can long maintain a level of individual attainment and a status of social justice that will greatly enrich humanity.

INFORMAL CONFERENCE: IS IT POSSIBLE FOR AMERICAN SOCIOLOGISTS TO AGREE UPON A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM?

George E. Vincent, University of Minnesota, Presiding.

ALBION W. SMALL, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. Chairman:

The topic proposed for this afternoon may look as though the proposers had in mind the adoption of precise plans and specifications for sociological building. In fact, nothing of this sort was intended. On the contrary, while the formulation of the general subject necessarily suggests the purpose of going to work on a definite and detailed "platform," the thing actually hoped for was a sort of harking back to the ideas which we have in common, whether we had been expressing them directly during this session or not, with possibly two or three concrete proposals which might serve to focalize our belief in these guiding ideas upon certain lines of immediate action. It was hoped that representatives of the different types of interest that are grouped around the sociological standpoint might each have something to say from and for his peculiar kind of pursuit.

As my most intimate professional concern is probably more abstractly generalized than any other that is likely to voice itself here, I venture to say my say at the outset, in the hope that, by the time I am through, others will be ready to speak for less general sociological aims.

My idea of a constructive policy for sociologists is a policy which, whatever its immediate aim and distinctive method, will always orient itself with reference to this "categorical imperative": *Always do your part toward compelling everyone to treat human experience, from beginning to end, and especially at the pending moment, as a connected system of problems in morals.*

If our friend Professor Ward were with us, that phrase *problems in morals* would rasp his nerves until he had been assured of the sense in which it was used. He would agree with me after I had guarded myself against very pertinent suspicions. I do not mean that life is perpetual problems in morals in the sense that it is problems of how the group x may induce the group y to adopt the courses of conduct which the *mores* of x demand. I do not mean problems in morals in the sense of discovering ways and means of imposing certain ethical conceptions or codes of conduct upon people who either feel no obligation to such conformity, or who decline to recognize the obligation. I mean that it is part and parcel of intelligent sociology to visualize life as *incessant readjustments of responsible persons to one another;* i.e., as a perpetual problem of the accommodation of human interests, which interests are constantly

changing their specific forms and contents, and consequently their qualitative and quantitative relations.

It is an incident of loyalty to this comprehensive conception of life, that we shall daily and hourly renew our faith in the principle, to which we must have recourse for reassurance that life is something more than physics or physiology, viz., that *human valuations are creative forces.* Within certain inhibitive limits of both physical and social sorts, which we have no desire either to ignore or to minimize, we do make ourselves and our world in consequence of saying to ourselves in more or less disguising circumlocutions, such and such is the sort of self I want to be, and such and such is the sort of world which I wish to inhabit.

The most inflated ultimatum of conceited dogmatism is the formula, *You can't change human nature!* This first aid to the mentally injured is either an impregnable truism or an asinine stupidity, according to the meaning which we put into it. In this company it would be an unpardonable waste of time to rehearse details or illustrations of the axiomatic sense of this formula. There are some things about human nature which can no more be changed than the law of gravitation or the affinities of chemical elements. If we were conferring for our benefit alone, it would be equally a waste of time to repeat what every sociologist knows, that in another sense change of human nature has been the main occupation of the species from the time its record began. The differences between modern humans and other predatory animals are the proofs that human nature has changed radically since the *genus homo* started in business. If anyone supposes that the changes are finished, he hasn't digested the primary lesson of history. Men are continually altering their views of life, and changing their aims, their habits, and their character accordingly. If anybody in the later days of the Republic had said that the time would ever come when a Roman gentleman would acquire wealth by any other means than war, he would have been shut out of polite society. If anyone in the days of Charles the First had declared that an English gentleman would ever get his income from any other source than his ancestral acres, he would have been rated as a disturber of the peace. If anyone in 1776 had declared that economic operations would ever take the corporate form, the people who rested assured that human nature cannot change would have notified him, as good old Adam Smith did in so many words, that the facts of human nature make it impossible that corporations can ever be a considerable factor in business. The fact is that the changing of human nature always has been the most prolific industry in the world, and the indications are that this industry still has a brighter future than any other.

My plea to the sociologists is that, however they specialize, whatever the particular kind of research they concentrate upon, they will never stop orienting themselves by means of the main outlook that the human lot is a riddle without plausible answer, unless we construe it as having its meaning in the production of a progressively fitter physical, mental, and moral human nature.

Every program that we follow, whether into analytical detail or into large constructions, whether of interpretation or of control, will get its rank in wisdom from the closeness of its co-ordination with this view of life.

Perhaps I should not have ventured to claim more of the time of this session, if resistance to this conception had not been so much in evidence, not in our own number but among our colleagues in the Economic Association. I am not so vain or so irritable that I could blame the economists for holding different opinions from mine. It is not an individual grievance, however, but a social misfortune, that the economists and the sociologists are not yet able to criticize their opinions by the common test of an ethical conception of life. Professor Schmoller has had fairly good standing as an economist. He has managed to move in rather influential strata of German society. He was speaking as an economist when he said in the early seventies, "demand and supply are a section of the moral standards of the community." He has been insisting on that proposition and on the whole ethical conception of economic theory ever since. Neither at home nor abroad has it roused any very successful impeachment of his mental competence. On the contrary, his influence throughout the world has been steadily increasing for nearly a half-century. In the United States, however, a sociologist cannot appeal to the moral values involved in a social problem without running against the traditional obstruction, "You can't change human nature."

If this means anything, it means that the economic nature of men is supposed to be so inflexible that there can never be a change of ratio between our present valuations of wealth and of the moral conditions of human beings with which wealth interests may be in competition. As time does not allow me to debate this question, I will simply put my demurrer in this form: The economic fiction that our valuations of wealth, in relation to moral values, are constant, contradicts the record of history and abundant facts in contemporary experience.

I am not eager to make myself an issue, but since I had the temerity to profess this belief in the presence of the economists the other evening, I have found myself treated as in contempt of court. The charges against me do not take open issue with the proposition that moral values must at last fix the rate scale for economic values. They take the safer strategic ground that the traditional theories of economic interest are impregnable, and that anyone who dares to assert the contrary is mentally unsound. Since Saturday evening gentlemen with whom I am on the best terms personally, meeting in clumps in this hotel, and in coteries at different points in the Twin Cities, have been wagging their professorial heads at allusions to what I said, and ringing changes on the theme, "Poor old demented specimen! He doesn't know the laws of political economy." It turns out that the "laws of political economy" which I am not supposed to know reduce to the generalization that there is an initial reluctance in our makeup against separating ourselves even temporarily from our possessions without an inducement. Now I haven't been studying political economy

for forty years without finding another "law," namely that we are permanently reluctant to pay for any accommodation more than we find out it is worth. My information is to the effect that whenever these two "laws" have come in conflict with each other—that is, incessantly, barring brief intervals for recuperation, since Cain and Abel quarreled over the relative value of farming and grazing products—they have had a perfect Irish of a time, until one or the other cried "enough!" and they have suspended hostilities on the basis of a compromise that held till they lined up for the next trial of strength. Before it gets to be a moral question at all, the figure that interest on capital cuts in our present theory and practice is an impeachment of our intelligence. I have no quarrel with the "laws of political economy." In the interest incidentally of political economy itself, I certainly shall quarrel as long as I have breath against every attempt to identify political economy with any single detached trait of human character. My case is that we are allowing capitalistic interests to take for granted what is not true about the moral claim of absentee ownership to income. It is a matter of first sweeping the cobwebs from our brains, so that we can see economic cause and effect as they are. Then it is a matter of getting a move on the inertia of our consciences, so that our program will be a revival of zeal for defensible correlation of material values with moral values.

In short—and this has been the burden of my song for twenty-five years—the main business of life is progress in controlling our conditions in such a way that, from generation to generation, the typical human being will break previous records in combination of all 'round physical and moral qualities.

My appeal to sociologists is that they continue to control their specializings as functions of this main progress.

ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SURVEYS

CHARLES R. HENDERSON, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Our students of social science in colleges and universities, in connection with charitable societies, churches, clubs, and municipal bureaus of welfare, are trying to secure information from primary sources. The pedagogical value of such studies is well understood. The movement is one to be encouraged.

But the dangers are obvious: annoyance of busy officials and agents; morbid and precocious exposure of young students to debasing aspects of life; waste of time with no result save the gratification of childish if not morbid curiosity; finally, a bad method of study.

The movement requires expert direction and wise plans. Investigation should be directed to promising fields. Schedules and methods should be carefully worked out by competent statisticians and should be uniform enough to secure comparable figures indicative of large and significant forces and

tendencies, without chilling the ardor of persons of independent thought and power of invention.

The various societies working for reliable data in one scientific field may be able to render a useful service by creating a joint commission to work out a plan of co-operation for isolated investigators. Thus local studies of family budgets in all parts of the country might be standardized so that each would contribute something of value. The health and recreation surveys in which so many classes are now engaged might proceed with a common plan. Such a commission would have the help of the trained people employed by the Russell Sage Foundation and certain life insurance companies. The American Association for Labor Legislation could be aided by local studies of wages, hours, shop conditions, and insurance schemes and "welfare work." The Economic Association and the Statistical Association have related interests, and many teachers of economics would give intelligent and sympathetic assistance.

These considerations point to the appointment by this Society of a committee which will be charged with the duty of studying the problem of co-operation and of conferring with kindred associations in regard to the best method of establishing a permanent joint commission to direct investigations in all parts of the national territory.

EDWARD C. HAYES, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Most of that which is called human nature is in reality second nature, that is to say, it is not nature at all, but is acquired. It is the individual's share in the product of social evolution, in the group to which he belongs.

Thus, for example, no one is born with a conscience. The question is, whether he ever gets one, and if so what will be required and what condemned by the conscience which he acquires. A generation ago many of the most Christian people in our southern states had consciences which approved of slavery. The conscience of Abraham approved the practice of polygamy. There are those whose conscience and sentiment approve of showing respect to departed parents by eating their corpses.

Human nature, or, rather, human second nature, is variable within wide limits, but at a given time and place shows such an established uniformity that an individual cannot see how normal human beings can think and feel and act, save in the ways which have become the second nature of his group. Uniformities of thought, of sentiment and of practice, which constitute customs and institutions of a distinct and consistent character, at a given time and place, change from one period to another, with the same population; and vary from place to place as flora and fauna do.

Participation in the social activities constitutes the substance of life for the individual. If any one of us should spend an hour with closed eyes in the attempt to recall one familiar practice in which he engages, one opinion that he holds, one ambition that he cherishes, or one moral approval or disapproval

by which he is moved, he would probably fail to find a single one which he would have had if he could have lived from infancy an isolated individual. This is what is meant by the statement that most of what we call human nature is in reality the individual's share in the product of social evolution in the group to which he belongs.

The prevalent activities, sentiments, and ideas which are the product and the substance of the social process constitute a type of reality as distinct as the animal or vegetable or mineral kingdom. Moreover, the varying character of these realities is due to intelligible causation as truly as are the phenomena studied by any other science. Chemistry and physics are experimental sciences. Biology and sociology are predominantly comparative sciences. The characteristic objects of sociological investigation are not specific events assignable to a given time and place, but species or types of reality, and these are analyzable into minute and immensely repetitious elements, viz., the specific socially caused activities of individual members of society. Out of such elements customs and institutions are built up.

Scientific explanation of any class of realities involves, first, the analysis of these realities into their elements, and, second, the tracing of causal relationships between the elements of which the reality is composed and between them and the environing phenomena. The environing phenomena are no part of the reality to be explained, but only factors in the explanation. Thus, the botanist in his explanation, must take account of degrees of temperature and moisture and qualities of soil. Yet these are not botanical realities but only factors in the explanation of botanical realities. Most of the confusion concerning the field of sociology results from failure to distinguish clearly between those realities which sociology should attempt to explain, and others which it should by no means attempt to explain, but which it must recognize as among the environing conditions that play a part in molding social realities. To the latter class belong facts of climate and natural resources, the artificial physical environment such as railways and housing, and also the traits of the physical organisms which constitute the population that is the bearer of the social process. Sociology explains no material phenomenon except in so far as explaining social activities may be said to explain the material results which those activities produce.

The same distinction may be made in the practical applications of sociology! In order to secure good housing where we now have a slum we may need to consult the plumber and the architect, but the knowledge which they supply is not sociology nor an application of sociology. In order, however, to secure the prevalence of good housing, we must employ other knowledge than that which they can furnish, we must know how to secure the prevalence of wants, of moral judgments enforced by public sentiment, and of co-operative activities. It is in knowledge of this latter sort that we find practical applications of sociology.

Sociology deals with types of thought and sentiment and practice which

prevail among human populations as a direct result of social interrelationship, though molded and limited also by inborn human nature and material environment. This class of realities, which are perfectly distinct from all others, analyzable into repetitious elements, highly variable, and the products of intelligible causation, is the sphere of sociological investigation. Their study may be prosecuted from purely scientific or from practical motives.

C. C. North, De Pauw University

I confess that I have never been able to become very much excited or worried over agreements or lack of agreements in sociology. As it appears to me just now, I believe that agreements of a very definite sort are neither possible nor desirable—that is, if they are to be formal agreements.

In so far as a unity of thought and method in any science comes about, it does not come from a group of scientists sitting down and taking thought how they may agree. Each goes about his work of course, conscious of the work of his neighbors, but not with any formal program before him. And after a number have been working for some time in this individual way it is discovered that their results do present a unified whole, that there is a common element and a common method running through the work of all.

I do not think our neighbors, the economists, are worrying greatly about whether they are poaching on someone else's field or whether someone is on theirs. Nor does any group of men with serious work to do stop long to consider the formal limitations of their field.

There is plenty of work for all of us to do. And we are constantly sensitive to what others in our field are doing, and subconsciously, if not consciously, adjusting our work to that work. But I do not see how it would further our work to try to define any formal limitations that would have any authoritative influence in determining the work of individual sociologists.

H. A. Miller, Olivet College

The economists at these meetings have been indulging in a good many witticisms to the effect that the sociologists were not quite sure that they occupied any particular field. The papers in this series of meetings have certainly indicated a clearness of differentiation which the economists have not exhibited. At our meetings yesterday we were discussing definite group expressions that were certainly not economic. The economists this morning were discussing syndicalism, and their discussion was much more psychological than economic. That session really belonged to us.

It seems to me that some of the work that we try to do does belong more distinctly to the economist. Thus matters of relief are more economic than sociological. To be sure, sociology must describe a standard, but the practical problem of dealing with economic problems may belong to the economist more

than to us. In other words, it seems to me that we have appropriated rather more than belongs to us. The social work of women's clubs, settlements, and all sorts of municipal organizations are called sociology. It certainly is no nearer related to the kind of thing we were dealing with yesterday as sociology than physics is related to chemistry.

SAMUEL N. REEP, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

It is not clear to me what is meant here by a "constructive program." If some type of national policy is meant, I do not think that sociology as a science has advanced far enough to come to an agreement. If a social tendency is meant like collectivism, I think we might come to an agreement.

Too often and too generally is the sociologist considered a program-maker rather than a scientist, a promoter rather than an investigator. This is not saying that a sociologist as a citizen should not contribute something toward a national policy and toward good government, or that he is not to be a promoter of social reforms, even such far-reaching reforms as would mean a fundamental reorganization of industrial and political society. But for the sociologists to agree on any program of that kind and to attempt to give it prestige by calling it scientific would justly, in my opinion, relegate sociology to the scrap heap of social programs and postpone the day when it will be generally conceded that a general science of society is possible.

I believe that the American sociologists could agree that conscious effort to improve social conditions is not in itself unscientific, any more than Luther Burbank's efforts to produce better varieties of plants. While we may agree that poverty can be lessened, we could not agree on a program to bring it about. Some think it would require a fundamental reconstruction of society while others may think that certain minor readjustments would solve the problem.

After all I think we can agree best as social scientists that we must give primary attention to scientific methods and patiently work out the laws and principles in social phenomena.

PAUL L. VOGT, MIAMI UNIVERSITY

The phrase "constructive program" could be applied to definite plans in several phases of the work now included under the term "sociology." It could be applied to a program of social reform, to be undertaken immediately in somewhat the same manner as the American Association for Labor Legislation is attacking the problems within its field; it could be applied to a program of advance in the realm of social theory; or it might be applied to a method of study of the social problems now presenting themselves for solution. It appears to me that whatever may be the conclusion of this body as to the first two types of program, the motion made by Professor Henderson which has just been approved providing for a committee to work out some plan of correlating the field studies of social phenomena made by the students in the several institutions of learning so that all will be directed toward some definite end

is a very specific agreement upon a constructive program. It is a program in method of study which should be productive of as great results as if the society should agree upon united action on some one social problem.

ROBERT A. WOODS, SOUTH END HOUSE, BOSTON

It is of the highest importance to a constructive program that we should have a just conception of what sort of thing we wish to construct. If we are to discover and follow the ways of life we must have some postulate as to the essential inwardness of life. Otherwise we detect only those more superficial clues that end in the mechanics of our subject.

Much sociology seems to proceed on the assumption that life is a transcendent mechanism. This is an inheritance from the elementary, overconfident stage of physical science, out of which the scientific world is now passing Life is coming once more to be viewed, not as a technique, but as an afflatus. The psychological corrective to the study of objective social phenomena must bring us back to the great questions upon which the interests of philosophy and religion in the past have focused. A new approach to the ultimate moral problem of the freedom of the human will is preparing. Sociology may perhaps not include the effort to solve these problems; but this surely means that it must not commit itself consciously to a theory of life which would disqualify it for appreciating the next historic spiritual awakening.

ROBERT E. PARK, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

It is true, of course, that the application of scientific methods to the investigation of social phenomena and the application of the results of these investigations to the control of social life have had a tendency to substitute machinery and technique in the place of sympathy and common-sense in our dealing with human beings.

In the last analysis, science, at least natural science as distinguished from history, *is* technique. It is the result of an effort to discover among things that turn up in our experience the relation of cause and effect; to base thereon general rules which enable us to predict what is likely to happen in other similar cases. It is the business of sociology, in studying human affairs, to look for these same relations of cause and effect; to lay down general rules which enable us to predict from the existence of the situation A the succeeding situation B. On the basis of such general observations, even if they are never formulated with the logical precision here indicated, all formal methods or organizations for the control or improvement of social life must rest.

If we are to deal in an effective or economical way with social conditions, we must push scientific investigation and extend and improve our technique as far as it is possible to do so. This is the main business of sociology as a science and a method.

On the other hand, it is necessary, in order to deal practically with human beings, to understand individual men and women. The practical sociologist

must have the ability to enter into the inner life and share the feelings and sentiments of all sorts of people. The old French adage says, "To comprehend all is to forgive all," and something like this sort of comprehension is necessary to those of us who are dealing with the human beings under the conditions of ordinary, modern social life.

What I should like to call attention to here, however, is that there is a distinction, made some years ago by the German philosopher Windelband, and afterward emphasized by Münsterberg, that seems to apply here. Windelband said, as I remember, that there was a fundamental difference, not only in the method, but in the aim of what he called the historical and natural sciences, including among the natural sciences sociology and psychology. He pointed out that there was a fundamental difference between a historical and a natural science fact. The difference consists in this: the historical fact has a location and a date and it occurs once only. A fact of natural science, however, is one that can be repeated and hence one that can be tested by experience. The significance of the distinction is this: the fact of natural science is of such a character that it enables us to predict, it enables us to use our knowledge about one object to determine how we should behave toward all objects of that same class.

The historical fact exists once for all, is never repeated, and can, therefore, never be verified, at least not by experience. More than that, the historian, unlike the natural scientist, is interested in the particular, the peculiar, and the unprecedented and unpredictable things about a situation or about a human being. History brings these facts together, not merely to enable us to control but to enable us to comprehend. History seeks to put us in the actual presence of persons and things, to stimulate in us a sense of the surroundings and environment in which the events which it describes took place. It seeks to enable us thus to enter into the thoughts and sentiments of the people who are the actors in the drama it seeks to describe. History is, in short, the means through which we get that intimate, personal, sympathetic, and comprehending understanding of individuals and situations which makes us fit to pass moral judgments in regard to their behavior, a kind of comprehension that we are likely to lose to the extent that we depend on formal and technical methods in dealing with human situations.

Now the point to which I am directing my remarks is not exactly the difference between history and sociology, nor the difference between history and natural science. I am trying to emphasize, rather, the fact that there are methods by which sociologists can gain this insight which history gives. The method to which I refer is the intensive study of typical and individual cases. The intimate personal experiences of individuals who represent classes, races, nationalities, or localities are valuable materials for this purpose. A study of the inner life, in contrast with the former and conventional life of individuals, offers, it seems to me, materials for investigation which will lay the ground for sounder and more effective methods of dealing with human problems than the sociological discipline has yet afforded.

THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR DECEMBER 27, 1912, TO DECEMBER 27, 1913

Receipts

a)	Balance on hand, December 27, 1912	$ 921.65	
b)	Royalty on sale of publications, to June 30, 1912	103.50	
c)	Payment by resigning members for part-year subscriptions to the *American Journal of Sociology*, less exchange	7.15	
d)	Dues for 1913, less exchange	1,346.78	
e)	Dues for 1914, less exchange	30.00	
	Total		$2,409.08

Expenditures

a)	Secretary's expenses to Boston meeting, approved by Executive Committee, December 28, 1912	$ 85.00	
b)	Office equipment. letter files, cards, etc	6.92	
c)	Postage, regular correspondence, invitations to join, telegrams, etc	21.03	
d)	Printing, circular letters, change address slips, etc	11.20	
e)	Programs for annual meeting, postage, and clerical aid in sending out	34.18	
f)	Letterheads, envelopes	16.20	
g)	Printing Vol. VII of *Proceedings*	379.20	
h)	University of Chicago Press for the *American Journal of Sociology* sent to members	792.11	
i)	University of Chicago Press for the *American Journal of Sociology* sent to prospective members	1.11	
j)	Stenographic and clerical help	121.16	
k)	Campaign for new members, postage, etc., in 1913	51.87	
	Total		$1,519.98
	*Balance on hand, December 27, 1913		$ 889.10

*Includes $500.00 on deposit at 3 per cent interest since January 3, 1913, at Woodlawn Trust and Savings Bank.

The Society does not owe anything and has due it the royalty on its publications since June 30, 1913.

The accounts and papers in connection with the above Statement have been audited and found correct.

(Signed) S. N. REEP,
JOHN M. GILLETTE,
Auditors.

Date December 31, 1913.

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ARTICLE I—NAME

This society shall be known as the American Sociological Society.

ARTICLE II—OBJECTS

The objects of this society shall be the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of intercourse between persons engaged in the scientific study of society.

ARTICLE III—MEMBERSHIP

Any person may become a member of this society upon payment of Three Dollars, and may continue such by paying thereafter annually a fee of Three Dollars.

By a single payment of Fifty Dollars any person may become a life member of the society.

Each member is entitled to a copy of the current publications of the society.

ARTICLE IV—OFFICERS

The officers of this society shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer—elected at each annual meeting—and an Executive Committee consisting of the officers above mentioned *ex officio*, together with six elected members whose terms of office shall be three years; except that of those chosen at the first election two shall serve for but one year and two for two years.

The offices of Secretary and of Treasurer may be filled by the same person.

ARTICLE V—ELECTION OF OFFICERS

All officers shall be elected only after nomination by a special committee of the society appointed by the Executive Committee; except that the officers for the first year shall be nominated by a committee of three, to be appointed by the chairman of the meeting at which this constitution is adopted.

All officers shall be elected by a majority vote of the members of the society present at the annual meeting.

ARTICLE VI—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

The President of the society shall preside at all meetings of the society and of the Executive Committee, and shall perform such other duties as the Executive Committee may assign to him. In his absence his duties shall devolve,

successively, upon the Vice-Presidents in the order of their election, upon the Secretary, and upon the Treasurer.

The Secretary shall keep the records of the society, and perform such other duties as the Executive Committee may assign to him.

The Treasurer shall receive and have the custody of the funds of the society, subject to the rules of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee shall have charge of the general interests of the society, shall call regular and special meetings of the society, appropriate money, appoint committees and their chairmen, with suitable powers, and in general possess the governing power in the society, except as otherwise specifically provided in this constitution. The Executive Committee shall have power to fill vacancies in its membership occasioned by death, resignation, or failure to elect, such appointees to hold office until the next annual election.

Five members shall constitute a quorum of the Executive Committee, and a majority vote of those members in attendance shall control its decisions.

ARTICLE VII—RESOLUTIONS

All resolutions to which objection is made shall be referred to the Executive Committee for its approval before submission to the vote of the society.

ARTICLE VIII—AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this constitution shall be proposed by the Executive Committee and adopted by a majority vote of the members present at any regular or special meeting of the society.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

MEMBERSHIP LIST FOR THE YEAR 1914

(Numbers in parentheses indicate date of joining)

Abratani, Dr. Jiro, Hamadera Park, Osaka, Japan. (Prior to 1910)
Adams, Charles Francis, 84 State St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Addams, Jane, Hull House, 800 South Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Akerley, Dr. A. W., National Home, Danville, Ill. (1914)
Alexander, Carlotta, 1701 Crilly Court, Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Allaben, M. C., Room 710, 156 5th Ave., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Alling, Mortimer H., Box 1232, Providence, R.I. (1910)
Anderson, Charles T., 625 Francis St., Madison, Wis. (1913)
Arner, G. B. L., Jefferson, Ohio. (1911)
Arnold, Felix, 824 St. Nicholas Ave., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Arnold, Sarah Louise, 9 Crescent Ave., Newton Center, Mass. (1911)
Aronovici, Carol, 411 Empire Bldg., 13th and Walnut Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Athey, Mrs. C. N., 100 South Patterson Park Ave., Baltimore, Md. (1911)
Austin, Ralph C., 610 Woodruff Bldg., Joliet, Ill. (1911)
Avery, Mrs. Rachel Foster, The Langdon, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Babcock, Albert, Box 85, Providence, R.I. (1914)
Badanes, Saul, 24 Casco St., Woodhaven, L.I., N.Y. (1914)
Baer, Allen U., Glasgow, Mont. (1911)
Baker, Alfred L., 141 La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Baker, O. E., 3616 Newark St. N.W., Washington, D.C. (1912)
Balch, Miss Emily, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. (1911)
Baldwin, Simeon E., New Haven, Conn. (1913)
Bard, Harry Erwin, 407 West 117th St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Barlow, Burt E., Coldwater, Mich. (1913)
Barrett, Don C., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. (1910)
Bartholomew, E. F., 741 34th St., Rock Island, Ill. (1913)
Bartholomew, Virgil W., Michigan City, Ind. (1913)
Batten, S. Z., 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Beach, Walter G., University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. (Prior to 1910)
Beckwith, Lorania C., 72 Manning St., Providence, R.I. (1913)
Bedford, Scott E. W., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1912)
Beller, William F., 51 East 123d St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Bengtson, Caroline, 1201 East 60th St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Benton, Andrew A., 79 Wall St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Bernard, L. L., Gainesville, Fla. (Prior to 1910)
Bernheimer Charles S., Hebrew Educational Society, Pitkin Ave. and Watkins St., Brooklyn, N.Y. (1910)
Bhattacharya, Basudeb, 6032 Ingleside Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Binder, Rudolph M., 46 Grove Place, East Orange, N.J. (1910)
Bittner, W. S., care of Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich. (1912)

Bizzel, William B., College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Tex. (1912)
Black, George H., 1505 Prospect Ave., Lewiston, Idaho. (1914)
Blackmar, F. W., University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. (Prior to 1910)
Blagden, Edward S., 113 East 64th St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Blaine, Anita McCormick, 101 East Erie St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Blair, Mary Pierpont, 15 Ellery St., Cambridge, Mass. (1913)
Blakey, Leonard S., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Boardman, John R., 515 West 122d St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Bogardus, Emory S., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal. (1913)
Bossard, James H. S., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. (1913)
Bostwick, Arthur E., St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Mo. (1912)
Boutelle, Mrs. C. M., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn. (1912)
Bowerman, George F., Public Library, Washington, D.C. (1911)
Bowman, C. A., Albright College, Myerstown, Pa. (1913)
Brackett, Jeffry R., 41 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Bridge, Norman, 10 Chester Place, Los Angeles, Cal. (1911)
Bristol, Lucius Moody, 156 Prospect St., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Britton, Gertrude Howe, 816 South Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Brooks, John Graham, 8 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass. (1914)
Bruder, Victor William, 12 North Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Bullock, Charles E., Canton, Pa. (1911)
Burdette, Mrs. Robert J., 891 Orange Grove Blvd., Pasadena, Cal. (1913)
Burgess, E. W., University Club, Lawrence, Kan. (1912)
Bushee, Frederick A., University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. (Prior to 1910)
Bushnell, C. J., Forest Grove, Ore. (1910)
Butterfield, Kenyon L., Amherst, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Byrne, Mary G., 1127 Felicity St., New Orleans, La. (1913)
Byrnes, Clara, Normal College of City of New York, Park Ave. and 68th St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Calhoun, Arthur W., Maryville, Tenn. (1913)
Campbell, Peter F., 92 Broad St., Newark, N.J. (1910)
Canis, Edward N., The Canis Cabin, Clermont, Marion Co., Ind. (1910)
Cape, Mrs. Emily Palmer, Hotel Webster, 40 West 45th St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Capen, Edward W., 146 Sargeant St., Hartford, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Capper, Arthur, Topeka, Kan. (1911)
Carpenter, S. N., 609 Pine St., Johnstown, Pa. (1910)
Carroll, Howard R., Box 552, Florence, Colo. (1914)
Carstens, C. C., 43 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Carter, James, Lincoln University, Pa. (1910)
Carver, Thomas N., Rural Organization Service, Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Case, Mills E., 236 6th Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Caver, M. S., 400 T St. N.W., Washington, D.C. (1914)
Chaddock, Robert E., Kent Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (1911)
Chamberlain, Joseph P., 606 Kent Hall, Columbia Univer[illegible]ty, New York, N.Y. (1914)
Chapin, F. Stuart, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (1910)
Chu, C., Hartley Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (1912)
Clark, Earle, Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East 22d St., New York, N.Y. (1912)

Clark, Edwin Leavitt, 400 West 118th St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Clark, Miss Georgie, 7712 Hough Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. (1914)
Clark, Robert Fry, Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y. (1912)
Clopper, Edward N., 561 Steamboat Road, Greenwich, Conn. (1913)
Clow, Frederick R., Oshkosh, Wis. (Prior to 1910)
Cochran, William F., Woodbrook, Md. (1913)
Cole, Katherine, 430 East 41st St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Commander, Lydia K., Pine Hill, Ulster County, N.Y. (1912)
Cooley, Charles H., 703 Forest Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. (Prior to 1910)
Coolidge, Ellen H., 81 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass. (1913)
Corbett, Gertrude M., National Home, Milwaukee County, Wis. (1913)
Cott, W. R., Shell Lake, Wis. (1912)
Crafer, T. W. B., Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. (1913)
Craig, Wallace, University of Maine, Orono, Me. (1913)
Crampton, H. E., Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (1911)
Crane, Harry W., 808 Oakland Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. (1913)
Crane, Mrs. W. M., Dalton, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Croly, Herbert D., Windsor, Vt. (1913)
Cross, W. T., 1223 East 57th St., Chicago, Ill. (1911)
Curtis, Henry S., Olivet, Mich. (1913)
Cutler, Harry, 48 Marlborough Ave., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Cutler, J. Elbert, 11311 Hessler Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (Prior to 1910)
Cutler, U. Waldo, 63 Lancaster St., Worcester, Mass. (1911)
Daniels, John, 801–7 Garrett Bldg., Baltimore, Md. (1914)
Davis, Edward H., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. (Prior to 1910)
Davis, Michael M., Jr., Boston Dispensary, Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Davis, Otto W., 1120 North Vincent Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. (1913)
Davis, William Lloyd, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Dealey, James Q., Brown University, Providence, R.I. (Prior to 1910)
Deming, J. L., Iowa State University, Iowa City, Ia. (1913)
Dennis, Herbert K., Hightstown, N.J. (1913)
Dennis, James Shepard, Box 175, Montclair, N.J. (1913)
Dennis, Laban, 49 Ridge St., Orange, N.J. (1913)
Dennison, Henry S., 26 Franklin St., Boston, Mass. (1914)
Devine, Edward T., Room 607, Kent Hall, 116th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Dewell, James S., Missouri Valley, Ia. (1913)
Dewey, F. A., Yarrow West, Bryn Mawr, Pa. (1913)
Dexter, Robert C., 31 Center St., Brockton, Mass. (1914)
Dickman, J. W., Fayette, Ia. (1913)
Dimock, George E., Elizabeth, N.J. (1913)
Dougherty, M. Angelo, Cambridge, Mass. (1911)
Dowd, Jerome, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. (Prior to 1910)
Dummer, Mrs. W. F., 679 Lincoln Park Blvd., Chicago, Ill. (1910)
Dutton, Samuel T., Gage Hill Inn, Spuyten Duyvil, New York, N.Y. (1913)
Earp, E. L., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N.J. (Prior to 1910)
Easley, Ralph Montgomery, 33d Floor, Metropolitan Tower, New York, N.Y. (1914)
Eaves, Lucile, 2704 Virginia St., Berkeley, Cal. (1910)
Eberle, Warren C., 12 Charles St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Edmonds, Franklin S., 614 Franklin Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Edwards, Stephen O., 181 Lloyd Ave., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Ellis, George W., 3262 Vernon Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1911)
Ellwood, Charles A., 407 College Ave., Columbia, Mo. (Prior to 1910)

Elmer, M. C., 6026 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1912)
Ely, Owen, 5635 Grand Central Terminal, New York, N.Y. (1912)
Emerson, Elliot S., 395 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass. (1913)
Estabrook, Arthur F., 15 State St., Boston, Mass. (1913)
Evans, Ira Hobart, Austin, Tex. (1913)
Ewing, Halle L., R.F.D. No. 8, Lincoln, Neb. (Prior to 1910)
Eyerly, Elmer Kendall, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass. (1911)
Faber, Aaron D., 700 Church Lane, Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Fairchild, H. P., 185 St. Ronan St., New Haven, Conn. (1911)
Farnam, H. W., 43 Hillhouse Ave., New Haven, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Faulkner, J. P., care of State Penitentiary, Lansing, Kan. (1914)
Faust, Allen K., 162 Higashi Sambancho, Sendai, Japan. (Prior to 1910)
Faust, Charles J., 1220 East Normal St., Kirksville, Mo. (1911)
Fehlandt, August F., Michigan, N.D. (1913)
Feis, Herbert, 745 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. (1913)
Feutlicht, Morris M., 3034 Washington Blvd., Indianapolis, Ind. (1913)
Fieser, James L., 120 East Broad St., Columbus, Ohio. (1913)
Fischer, E. G., New Bremen, Ohio. (1913)
Fisher, Irving, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Fisk, D. M., 1516 College Ave., Topeka, Kan. (1911)
Fisk, Herbert F., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (1911)
Fiske, H., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Fleming, R. D., 1827 I St. N.W., Washington, D.C. (1911)
Foley, Roy William, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1912)
Foote, Allen R., 315 Linwood Ave., Columbus, Ohio. (1913)
Forbes, Miss C. B., 23 Trowbridge Road, Worcester, Mass. (1912)
Forrest, J. D., 30 Audubon Place, Indianapolis, Ind. (1910)
Foster, Solomon, 90 Treacy Ave., Newark, N.J. (1911)
Foster, Warren D., Care of *Youths' Companion*, Boston, Mass. (1913)
Fox, Gresham George, Metropolitan Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex. (1914)
Fox, Hugh F., 109 East 15th St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Freeman, Fred B., 28 South Main St., Concord, N.H. (1912)
Freer, H. H., Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. (1912)
Fuller, Frederic Henry, 277 Brook St., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Fuller, Grace, Michigan Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. (1914)
Fuller, Paul, 2 Rector St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Furth, Jacob, 5243 Waterman Ave., St. Louis, Mo. (1913)
Gardner, A. B., 618 East 3d St., Santa Ana, Cal. (1912)
Gardner, C. S., Norton Hall, Louisville, Ky. (1911)
Garland, F. D., 508 West 4th St., Dayton, Ohio. (1912)
Garretson, A. B., Order of Railway Conductors, Cedar Rapids, Ia. (1914)
Garst, Julius, 29 Oread St., Worcester, Mass. (1911)
Gehlke, C. E., Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio. (1912)
Geisse, W. F. G., R.F.D. No. 2, Great Barrington, Mass. (1911)
George, W. H., Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Gerin, Leon, Coaticooke, Quebec, Canada. (1910)
Giddings, Franklin H., Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Gill, C. O., Hartland, Vt. (1913)
Gillard, J. L., 405 Beardsley Ave., Elkhart, Ind. (1911)
Gillette, George W., Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1914)
Gillette, John M., University of North Dakota, University, N.D. (1911)
Gillin, J. L., 209 Highland Ave., Madison, Wis. (Prior to 1910)

Gilman, Charlotte P., 627 West 136th St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Gilmore, Floy V., Box 32, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. (1914)
Giltner, Emmett E., 418 West 118th St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Glenn, John M., Russell Sage Foundation, 136 East 19th St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Godard, George S., State Librarian, Hartford, Conn. (1913)
Gompers, Samuel, Ouray Building, Washington, D.C. (1914)
Goodman, N. N., 436 Seventh St., Milwaukee, Wis. (1913)
Gordon, Armistead C., 405 East Beverley St., Staunton, Va. (1913)
Gowin, E. B., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Gram, J. P., 215 West 129th St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Gravelle, J. Silas, Y.M.C.A., Joplin, Mo. (1914)
Gray, R. S., 3535 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, Cal. (1911)
Green, Eleanor B., 12 John St., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Grossman, Louis, 528 Camden Ave., Avondale, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1911)
Groves, E. R., New Hampshire College, Durham, N.H. (1912)
Hagerty, J. E., 2644 Budlong Ave., Los Angeles, Cal. (Prior to 1910)
Halbert, L. A., 45 Waterworks Bldg., Kansas City, Mo. (1911)
Hale, Mary L., 3 Charles River Square, Boston, Mass. (1913)
Hale, Robert L., 537 West 121st St., New York, N.Y. (1912)
Hall, A. B., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Hall, Agnes M., 823 Irving Place, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Hall, John Oscar, 2047 7th Ave., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Hall, Thomas Cunning, 606 West 122d St., New York, N.Y. (1914)
Halsey, John J., Lake Forest, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Hankins, Frank H., Clark College, Worcester, Mass. (1910)
Harford, A. E., Worthington, Ohio. (1913)
Harris, Abram W., 31 West Lake St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Harris, Thomas L., Box 65, Waverly, Ill. (1911)
Harris, W. A., 806 Neave Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1913)
Havemeyer, Loomis, 90 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. (1912)
Hayes, E. C., 915 West Nevada St., Urbana, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Hebard, Grace Raymond, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo. (1914)
Heckard, M. O., 5416 Wayne Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Heffner, W. C., 3312 Woodland Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Helleberg, Victor E., 1725 Mississippi St., Lawrence, Kan. (1910)
Henderson, Charles R., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Hendricks, George B., Logan, Utah. (1911)
Herndon, John G., Jr., care of University Club, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Herron, Stella, 1933 Elysian Fields, New Orleans, La. (1913)
Hershey, O. F., Mt. Washington, Md. (1913)
Hess, Mrs. R. H., 237 Langdon St., Madison, Wis. (1913)
Hewes, Amy, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. (1910)
Hiester, A. V., Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Higbie, J. L., Jenera, Ohio. (1911)
Hildreth, Philo C., Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia. (1912)
Hill, Robert T., Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. (1910)
Hirsch, Arthur H, care of Ursinus College Library, Collegeville, Pa. (1913)
Hitchcock, Charles C., Ware, Mass. (1913)
Hitchcock, J. E., Oberlin, Ohio. (Prior to 1910)
Hoag, F. Victor, 131 South Waiola Ave., LaGrange, Ill. (1913)
Hoben, Allan, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Hoffman, John W., 120 West 3d St., Duluth, Minn. (1912)

Holler, H. P., Oriental University, 1919 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. (1914)
Holmes, George K., 1323 Irving St., Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Holmes, Roy H., Hillsdale, Mich. (1913)
Holt, L. H., West Point, N.Y. (1913)
Hoover, H. D. Carthage, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Hopkins, Louis J., Winnetka, Ill. (1913)
Hopkins, William Jay, 821 College Ave., Racine, Wis. (1913)
Horn, Frank L., Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo. (1913)
Hosford, George Lewis, Box 615, Wichita, Kan. (1913)
Hourwich, Isaac A., 180 Hewes St., Brooklyn, N.Y. (1913)
House, J. T., State Normal School, Wayne, Neb. (1911)
Hoverstadt, T. A., care of M., St.P. and S.S.M. R.R. Co., Minneapolis, Minn. (1913)
Howard, George E., 1910 E St., Lincoln, Neb. (Prior to 1910)
Howat, William F., 832 Hohman St., Hammond, Ind. (1911)
Howerth, I. W., Avalon, Cal. (1911)
Hubbell, George A., Lincoln Memorial University, Cumberland Gap, Tenn. (Prior to 1910)
Humphries, Jessie H., College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Tex. (1914)
Hunter, Robert, Highland Farm, Noroton Heights, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Huston, Charles A., 1048 Ramona St., Palo Alto, Cal. (1913)
Ignatius, Milton B., Public Service Commission, Albany, N.Y. (1913)
Ingram, Frances, 428 South 1st St., Louisville, Ky. (1914)
Inskeep, Annie Dolman, 2050 East 30th St., Oakland, Cal. (1912)
Irving, Bertha A., 102 Henderson Ave., New Brighton, N.Y. (1913)
Israel, Henry, 124 East 28th St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Jacobs, Phil P., 13 De Hart St., Morristown, N.J. (1911)
Jacobson, Henry A., 1959 West 20th St., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Jenks, Albert E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1913)
Johnson, Axel, Alta Vista, Kan. (1911)
Johnson, Edgar H., Emory College Library, Oxford, Georgia. (1913)
Johnson, Harriet E., 32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass. (1913)
Johnson, Joseph French, School of Commerce Library, 32 Waverly Place, New York, N.Y. (1913)
Jones, Thomas Jesse, United States Bureau of Education, Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Joseph, Isaac, 1827 East 82d St., Cleveland, Ohio. (1913)
Justis, Guy T., 156 East 5th St., Erie, Pa. (1913)
Kaplan, Nathan D., 1105 Ashland Block, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Katz, Jacob, 60 Henry St., New York, N.Y. (1914)
Kehew, Mrs. M. M., 29 A. Chestnut St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Keller, A. G., 55 Huntington St., New Haven, Conn. (Prior to 1910)
Kelley, Charles P., 1516 McGavock St., Nashville, Tenn. (1912)
Kelsey, Carl, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Kelsey, Fred W., 2, 3, 4 Cunningham Bldg., Joplin, Mo. (1914)
Kent, Charles Foster, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (1914)
Kerby, William J., Catholic University, Washington, D.C. (1912)
Kershner, Frederick D., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex. (1914)
Kiekhoefer, William, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1913)
Kinghorn, James A., 33 Cushing St., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Klee, Max, 1340 East 48th St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Kopf, Edwin W., Statistical Bureau, Metropolitan Life Insurance Bldg., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)

Kosbab, Hedwig A. F., 9410 Holton Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. (1913)
Kuanth, Oswald W., Princeton, N.J. (1914)
Kursheedt, M. A., 302 Broadway, New York, N.Y. (1911)
Lacy, Laura F., Delmar Morris Apartments, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. (1914)
Lakey, Frank E., English High School, Boston, Mass. (1913)
Lathrop Mrs. H. L., 2414 West Commerce St., San Antonio, Tex. (1913)
Lauck, W. Jett, 702 Southern Bldg., Washington, D.C. (1911)
Lauder, Frank, 803 Long Bldg., Kansas City, Mo. (1913)
Laufer, Berthold, Field Museum, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Lautner, J. E., Marquette, Mich. (1914)
Lay, U. C., 307 North Frances St., Madison, Wis. (1912)
Leavell, R. H., 5516 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Lechtrecker, Henry M., Inspector of State Institutions, Rockville Center, Long Island, N.Y. (1913)
Lee, Guy C., 172 West High St., Carlisle, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Lefavour, Henry, 3 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Lelacheur, Bessie S., 25 North Beacon St., Allston, Mass. (1913)
Le Roy, Cornelia, 116 East 58th St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Lichtenberger, J. P., Logan Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Lies, Eugene T., 168 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Light, John H., South Norwalk, Conn. (1913)
Lindsay, Edward, National Bank Bldg., Warren, Pa. (1911)
Lindsay, Samuel M., Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Lockwood, Alfred, St. Michael's Parish, North Yakima, Wash. (1914)
Lombardi, C., Dallas, Tex. (1910)
Longden, Gertrude, 1361 East 56th St., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Lowber, James W., 1706 Brazos St., Austin, Tex. (1911)
Lucas, Hardin, State Normal School, Valley City, N.D. (1911)
Luehring, F. W., Princeton, N.J. (Prior to 1910)
Lumley, F. E., College of Missions, Indianapolis, Ind. (1913)
Lynch, James M., 21 South Hawk St., Albany, N.Y. (1914)
McBride, Anna Christine, 303 College Ave., Columbia, Mo. (1914)
McBride, J. H., Pasadena, Cal. (1912)
McCaine, Mrs. Helen J., care of St. Paul Public Library, St. Paul, Minn. (1913)
MacClean, E. A., Room 401, 191 Broadway, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
McClean, L. D., 262 Maine St., Brunswick, Me. (1913)
McConnell, Francis J., 964 Logan St., Denver, Colo. (1910)
McCowen, Mary, 414 North Normal Parkway, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
McCullough, Joseph A., Greenville, S.C. (1914)
McDevitt, P. R., 21 South 13th St., Philadelphia, Pa. (1911)
McDowell, Mary E., 4630 Gross Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
MacFarland, Charles S., Room 613, 105 East 22d St., New York, N.Y. (1912)
McGregor, Tracy W., 239 Brush St., Detroit, Mich. (1913)
McKenzie, F. A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. (Prior to 1910)
McLane, Miss K. M., 211 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. (1912)
MacLean, Annie M., 5343 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
McLean, A., 2106 Linton Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. (1912)
MacMartin, David, Leadville, Colo. (1913)
MacVannel, John Angus, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (1911)
MacVeagh, Franklin, 194 North Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1913)

Mackey, Ebenezer, 314 Hamilton Ave., Trenton, N.J. (1913)
Macy, V. Everit, 68 Broad St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Madeira, Miss Lucy, 1330 19th St., Washington, D.C. (1911)
Mark, Mary Louise, 270 South State St., Westerville, Ohio. (1913)
Marshall, L. C., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Martin, Anne H., 4802 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1912)
Matscheck, Walter, 211 N. Murray St., Madison, Wis. (1913)
Matthews, M. A., 7th and Spring Sts., Seattle, Wash. (Prior to 1910)
Maxson, C. H., Bishop College, Marshall, Tex. (1914)
Maymon, Thomas B., 55 Eddy St., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Meloy, Luella P., Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1914)
Melville, Andrew H., 175 Main St., Oshkosh, Wis. (1912)
Meyer, Mrs. Adolf, 101 Edgedale Road, Roland Park, Md. (1913)
Miller, G. R., State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo. (1910)
Miller, H. A., Olivet College, Olivet, Mich. (Prior to 1910)
Miner, Frank N., 620 Newall St., Flint, Mich. (1913)
Mitchell, Harry W., State Hospital, Warren, Pa. (1913)
Mohr, Lewis, 349 West Illinois St., Chicago, Ill. (1911)
Moncrief, J. W., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Monroe, Paul, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Montgomery, Bell Woods, Industrial Institute and College, Columbus, Miss. (1913)
Morse, Anson E., 60 South St., Ware, Mass. (1913)
Mowery, H. H., 1345 5th Ave., Terre Haute, Ind. (1912)
Münsterberg, Hugo, 7 Ware St., Cambridge, Mass. (1913)
Munson, Myron A., 198 Exchange St., New Haven, Conn. (1913)
Naumburg, Mrs. Elsa H., 261 West 93d St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Nealley, E. M., R.F.D. No. 1, Santa Ana, Cal. (1911)
Neill, Charles P., 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Newman, Stephen M., Howard University, Washington, D.C. (1910)
Neystrom, Paul H., 1311 Morris St., Madison, Wis. (Prior to 1910)
Nichols, C. A., 523 West 122d St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
North, Cecil C., De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. (Prior to 1910)
Numford, Mrs. B. B., 503 East Grace St., Richmond, Va. (1913)
O'Connor, J. J., Jr., Mellon Institute, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1912)
Ogburn, W. F., Reed College, Portland, Ore. (1910)
Olson, Harry, Municipal Court, City Hall, Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Page, Edward D., Oakland, Bergen County, N.J. (1911)
Park, Robert E., Tuskegee Institute, Ala. (1914)
Parker, Arthur C., Education Bldg., Albany, N.Y. (1913)
Parker, G. A., 49 Pearl St., Hartford, Conn. (1913)
Parmelee, Maurice, College of City of New York, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Parrish, C. H., 947 6th St., Louisville, Ky. (1914)
Parrott, H. Irving, 7822 Sherman Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Parry, Carl E., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. (Prior to 1910)
Parsons, Edward S., Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. (1914)
Parsons, Mrs. Elsie Clews, 115 East 72d St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Parsons, Philip A., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. (1911)
Patten, Simon N., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Patterson, Gaylard H., 840 Union St., Salem, Ore. (1914)

Peak, George A., 1080 22d St., Des Moines, Ia. (1914)
Peixotto, Jessica B., Cloyne Court, Berkeley, Cal. (Prior to 1910)
Perky, Scott H., Apartment 85, 423 W. 120th St., New York, N.Y. (1914)
Peskind, A., 13035 Euclid Ave., East Cleveland, Ohio. (1913)
Peterson, Conrad, 1004 South 4th St., St. Peter, Minn. (1914)
Phelps, Edward B., 500 West 122d St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Plaisted, Elizabeth, Central High School, Birmingham, Ala. (1913)
Platt, Laura W., 1831 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Poland, Earl W., R.F.D. No.2, Hamilton, Ill. (1912)
Pound, Roscoe, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Powell, Hannah B. Clark, 5227 Blackstone Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Pratt, D. Butler, 295 Lexington St., Auburndale, Mass. (1912)
Price, William E., Lisbon, N.H. (1914)
Randall, J. Harvey, Bacone College, Bacone, Okla. (1913)
Randolph, E. F., 1654 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. (1911)
Rantoul, Mrs. Lois B., 101 Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass. (1914)
Rath, James A., P.O. Box 514, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1910)
Redstone, Edward H., Social Law Library, Boston, Mass. (1914)
Reep, Samuel N., 627 Oak St. N.E., Minneapolis, Minn. (Prior to 1910)
Reinemund, J. A., Box 95, Muscatine, Ia. (1912)
Rhoades, Mabel C., care of Wells College, Aurora, N.Y. (1912)
Richey, Mrs. S. O., 1719 I St., Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Richter, Erwin E., University Club, San Francisco, Cal. (1913)
Rieth, Pauline K., Galesville, Wis. (1912)
Riley, Morgan T., 125 West 92d St., New York, N.Y. (1912)
Riley, Thomas J., 447 Rugby Road, Flatbush, Brooklyn, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Ring, Avis, 50 Nevins St., Brooklyn, N.Y. (1913)
Roberts, Frank H. H., New Mexico Normal University, East Las Vegas, N.M. (1913)
Rockey, Carroll J., 314 North James St., Minneapolis, Minn. (1913)
Rolf, A. A., Room 1212, 72 West Adams St., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Rosenwald, Julius, care of Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Ross, E. A., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (Prior to 1910)
Roud, Mrs. Sadie M., 11 Grace St., Dorchester Center, Mass. (1913)
Rubinow, I. M., The Ocean, 59 John St., New York, N.Y. (1914)
Rueckert, Frederick, 7 Marlborough Ave., Providence, R.I. (1914)
Rumsey, Mrs. Dexter P., 742 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N.Y. (1913)
Rustone, B. A. T., 1416 North Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Sachs, R. L., 28 West 22d St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Samson, Harry G., 433 6th Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. (1911)
Schattschneider, Elmer, DeForest, Wis. (1912)
Schersten, Albert F., 1300 St. Olaf Ave., Northfield, Minn. (1913)
Schoenfeld, Julia, Playground Association of America, 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Scroggs, William O., Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La. (1911)
Seligman, E. R. A., Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Seliskar, John, St. Paul Seminary, Groveland Park, St. Paul, Minn. (1911)
Shaw, Frank L., 152 Common St., Lawrence, Mass. (1913)
Sheldon, A. E., Director, Nebraska Legislative Reference Bureau, Lincoln, Neb. (1913)
Shenton, H. W., 552 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. (1912)
Shepperd, Miss J. L., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn. (1914)

Shippee, Lester Burrell, Washington State College, Pullman, Wash. (1914)
Sibley, Florence, 1702 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Siedenburg, Frederic, Loyola Ave. and Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Simons, Sarah E., 1528 Corcoran St., Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Simpson, Joshua Baker, Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va. (1913)
Sims, Newell L., Box 313, Scarsdale, New York, N.Y. (1910)
Sites, C. M. Lacey, Anglo-Chinese College, Foochow, China. (1911)
Small, Albion W., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Smith, Alice M., 301 Warburton Bldg., 11th and C Sts., Tacoma, Wash. (1911)
Smith, C. Henry, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio. (1914)
Smith, Frederick M., P.O. Box 255, Independence, Mo. (1913)
Smith, F. M., Osseo, Wis. (1913)
Smith, Mrs. Mildred Cromley, 219 East Market St., Warren, Ohio. (1913)
Smith, Sam Ferry, 409 Union Bldg., San Diego, Cal. (1913)
Smith, Samuel G., 300 The Aberdeen, St. Paul, Minn. (1913)
Smith, Walter Robinson, 1232 North Market St., Emporia, Kan. (1913)
Smith, Wilberforce, W., 151 North Fairview Ave., Decatur, Ill. (1911)
Snedden, David, 500 Ford Bldg., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Snow, Helen H., Welfare Manager, Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Solensten, R. T., Y.M.C.A. Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla. (1913)
Spalding, F. S., 444 East 1st South St., Salt Lake City, Utah. (1913)
Sparkman, Maude, 847 South Dakota Ave., Tampa, Fla. (1914)
Spencer, Mrs. Anna Garlin, 502 Chestnut St., Meadville, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Spencer, C. C., 419 Main St., Joplin, Mo. (1914)
Spicer, R. Barclay, 140 North 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Stearns, Charles H., 502 South Sycamore St., Santa Ana, Cal. (1914)
Stebbins, Lucy Ward, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1913)
Steiner, B. C., Enoch Pratt Library, Baltimore, Md. (1911)
Sternheim, Emanuel, Greenville, Miss. (1913)
Sterns, Frederick H., Peabody Museum, Cambridge, Mass. (1911)
Stetson, George R., 1441 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C. (1911)
Steven, Helen, Chicago Refuge for Girls, 5024 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill. (1913)
Stewart, Anna, 852 West 35th Place, Los Angeles, Cal. (1914)
Stitt, Wilson, R.D., Piedmont, Ohio. (1913)
Stockstill, Webster T., 311 West Butler St., Bryan, Ohio. (1913)
Stone, Alfred H., Dunleith, Miss. (Prior to 1910)
Storms, A. B., 1205 Park Ave., Indianapolis, Ind. (1913)
Strong, Josiah, Bible House, Astor Place, New York, N.Y. (1913)
Sumner, George S., Pomona College, Claremont, Cal. (Prior to 1910)
Sutherland, Edwin H., care of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. (1911)
Sutton, Charles Wood, Apartado 889, Lima, Peru, South America. (1913)
Suzzallo, Henry, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (1910)
Swanton, John R., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (1913)
Taggart, Frederick S., Westfield, N.J. (1913)
Talbot, Marion, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Taylor, F. B., Jamestown College, Jamestown, N.D. (1914)
Taylor, Graham, Chicago Commons, Grand Ave. and Morgan St., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Tenney, Alvan A., Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Thomas, George, 217 East 4th North St., Logan, Utah. (1914)

Thomas, Joseph J., Central High School, Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Thomas, William I., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Thomas, W. W., 722 Cherry St., Springfield, Mo. (1914)
Thompson, H. Walter, McPherson, Kan. (1914)
Thompson, Warren S., 1513 South University Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. (1912)
Tinney, Mary C., 258 Willoughby Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. (1912)
Tittemore, J. N., R.F.D. No. 22, Omro, Wis. (1913)
Todd, A. J., University of Pittsburgh, Grant Blvd., Pittsburgh, Pa. (1912)
Tourtellot, Ida A., Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va. (Prior to 1910)
Towne, E. T., Northfield, Minn. (1914)
Trent, L. C., 203 South Tremont St., Kewanee, Ill. (1911)
Trimble, W. J., Agricultural College, N.D. (1914)
Tuckerman, Gustavus, care of City Club, 911 Locust St., St. Louis, Mo. (1913)
Tungeln, George H. von., Iowa State College, Ames, Ia. (1914)
Tunicliffe, R. M., 3 Chestnut St., Potsdam, N.Y. (1913)
Unger, Mrs. J. O., 3344 Evanston Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Vaile, Gertrude, 700 Emerson St., Denver, Colo. (1913)
Vanderlip, Frank A., 55 Wall St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Van Ingen, Philip, 125 East 71st St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Vassardakis, Cleanthes, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1912)
Veditz, C. W. A., 3028 Newark St., Cleveland Park, Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Vincent, George E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (Prior to 1910)
Vogt, Paul L., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. (1912)
Wainwright, S. H., No. 8 Tsukiji, Tokyo, Japan. (1911)
Walker, Edwin C., 244 West 143d St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Walling, William English, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y. (1913)
Wallis, Louis, 55 Middle Divinity, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Warbasse, J. P., Woods Hole, Mass. (1910)
Warfield, G. A., University of Denver, University Park, Colo. (1913)
Warner, A. R., Lakeside Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio. (1914)
Warren, Howard C., Princeton, N.J. (1913)
Waters, Chester C., South Swansea, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Watkins, George P., 154 Nassau St., New York, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Watrous, Paul Jerome, Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1914)
Watson, Mrs. Frank D., 825 West 180th St., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Weatherley, Ulysses G., 527 East 3d St., Bloomington, Ind. (Prior to 1910)
Webster, D. Hutton, Station A, Lincoln, Neb. (Prior to 1910)
Weeks, Rufus Wells, 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y. (1914)
Weiffenbach, Eugene, Warrenton, Mo. (1914)
Weinstock, H., 19 Presidio Terrace, San Francisco, Cal. (1913)
Welch, A. A., 21 Woodland St., Hartford, Conn. (1914)
Welch, Herbert, 23 Oak Hill, Delaware, Ohio. (1913)
West, Edith Randolph, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga. (1914)
West, Thomas Dyson, 10511 Pasadena Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. (1914)
Weyer, Edward M., Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. (1914)
White, Georgia L., Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich. (Prior to 1910)
Wilder, Constance P., 53 Fairmont Ave., Newton, Mass. (1913)

Wilkie, E. A., 50 Olive St., Boston, Mass. (1911)
Willcox, Walter F., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. (Prior to 1910)
Williams, Mrs. C. D., 12 Hawthorn St., Cambridge, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Williams, Ellis D., 560 Drexel Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. (1913)
Williams, George H., 1605 Pierce Bldg., 112 North 4th St., St. Louis, Mo. (1910)
Williams, James M., care of Hobart College Library, Geneva, N.Y. (1910)
Wilson, Guy, 512 Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo. (1913)
Wilson, Warren H., 156 5th Ave., New York, N.Y. (1912)
Winchell, S. R., 329 Plymouth Court, Chicago, Ill. (1914)
Wing, David L., Bureau of Corporations, Washington, D.C. (Prior to 1910)
Wissler, Clark, 77th St. and 8th Ave., New York, N.Y. (1913)
Wolfe, A. B., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. (Prior to 1910)
Wood, Stuart, 400 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. (Prior to 1910)
Woods, Erville B., Hanover, N.H. (Prior to 1910)
Woods, Frederick Adams, 1006 Beacon St., Brookline, Mass. (1911)
Woods, Robert A., South End House, Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)
Woodworth, A. H., Hanover College, Hanover, Ind. (1911)
Woolley, Mrs. Helen T., 343 Bryant Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1913)
Woolston, H. B., 431 West 121st St., New York, N.Y. (1910)
Work, Monroe N., Tuskegee Institute, Ala. (1910)
Wright, Jonathan, Post Graduate Medical School, 2d Ave. and 20th St., New York, N.Y. (1911)
Yockey, F. M., Knoxville, Ia. (1911)
Zeller, J. C., 5729 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Prior to 1910)
Zielonka, Martin, P.O. Box 817, El Paso, Tex. (1914)
Zueblin, Charles, 9 Myrtle St., Boston, Mass. (Prior to 1910)