

invade the graft, and also more fibrous tissue is formed, while the lymphocytes are seen to appear in very large numbers early in the process. In the case of tissue transplanted from a foreign species, the blood vessel reaction is further reduced and the number of fiber-forming cells and lymphocytes is also considerably decreased.

It is one of the most interesting of biological facts that the blood vessels and cells, especially the lymphocytes, thus behave in a specific manner in accordance with the relationship between graft and host. It appears that they are capable of distinguishing fine and delicate differences in relationship. We may justly say, with Loeb, that the reactions which thus take place are the finest biochemical reactions known at the present time. They surpass the serum reactions which permit a distinction only between individuals of dif-

ferent species, and only rarely between individuals of the same species.

Thus it appears that monkey glands cannot be successfully grafted on human beings. But the clients of gland therapeutists need not be downhearted. They can still obtain gland pills. What is more, inasmuch as monkey glands are not destroyed instantly in the human body, it is still possible for these credulous ones to enjoy a transitory benefit from them. However, our laboratory scientists are not so slow as to let Nature monopolize the field. Not only have they already isolated the active substance of some of the endocrine glands, but they are going one step further by artificially synthesizing such substances as adrenalin and thyroxin. If progress goes on in this direction it will not be long before all the quack surgeons and gland pill peddlars will be forced out of business.

Sociology

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY IN 1925

BY HARRY ELMER BARNES

THE status of sociology as an academic and scientific subject in the United States in 1925, as compared with its position at the opening of the century, presents a problem which needs to be examined. There is no doubt that the students registered in sociology departments have increased in number even more rapidly than the college population as a whole. On the other hand, all the large and influential universities which excluded sociology a generation ago have been able to maintain this anachronistic and short-sighted policy up to the present time, while the graduate departments which existed in 1900 have, in general, become weaker. This is particularly depressing in the light of the fact that graduate departments inevitably must be the places of training for the future teachers of undergraduates. Unless the present situation is remedied, ever greater numbers of under-

graduates will be taught sociology hereafter by increasingly ill-trained instructors.

The decline in the excellence of the graduate schools, as well as the success of certain institutions in excluding sociology entirely from their curriculum, are due to a number of causes. In the first place must be listed the opposition of the pure and pious folk who look upon sociology as a subject which undermines morality and leads to atheism and Socialism. There is some logical ground for this fear, for while the science, when properly taught, provides the only sure foundation for any valid body of morality or any social religion, it is true that it presumes to analyze with frankness the anachronisms and defects in the present moral code, the prevailing religion, and the capitalistic economy.

Again, one must list among the powerful sources of opposition to sociology the jealousy of the other social sciences. History, economics and political science were established as academic subjects from a century to a half century earlier than sociology.

This has given them a far stronger hold upon the faculties and administrative boards of the universities. The opposition of such vested interests has been intensified by the fact that the vivid human appeal of sociology has attracted to its courses large numbers of students who might otherwise have been swelling the class registers and enhancing the prestige of solemn teachers of history, political science or economics. Therefore, in certain institutions, such as Princeton, Harvard, Cornell, California and the Johns Hopkins, sociology has been excluded altogether, or has been offered in a wholly inadequate and misleading fashion by professors of economics or social work. In many other institutions, while courses in sociology are tolerated, the instructors have been kept under the general control of the department of economics. To this opposition of the older social sciences must also be added the even more vigorous antipathy of the departments of literature and philosophy.

But all the same the responsibility for the decline of sociology as a university subject lies in considerable part at the door of the sociologists themselves, and here the great evils have been discipleship and provincial jealousy. Sociology was founded in this country by a number of very capable but highly dogmatic men. They have, in general, tended to surround themselves with satellites whose chief function has been to expound in a faithful and reverent manner the details of their masters' Olympic utterances. It is only rarely that the most scholarly and independent type of mind is satisfied to remain a mere disciple of even the most brilliant and lovable master. In consequence, the most brilliant students of the early masters of sociology, instead of remaining in the universities to build up and replenish the graduate departments, have been turned out into the undergraduate institutions as instructors in general college courses, or have abandoned the academic career entirely to undertake outside research. The better men in sociology have been taken but rarely

into the great graduate departments, while those who have been retained by the masters have tended, with a few notable exceptions, to be of an imitative, unoriginal and uninspired character. This demand on the part of the founders of sociology in this country for reverent and unquestioning discipleship seems to me to be far and away the most important cause of the decline of sociology in academic distinction. To it may be added the domination of politics and personal intrigue in the award of academic honors and offices. Neither amiability nor solemnity nor piety should, in itself, be regarded as an adequate qualification for the presidency of the American Sociological Society.

The ravages of jealousy among sociologists in this country have been inseparably associated with the dogmatism and intolerance of the leaders of the science. Instead of saving their energies for defending sociology against its enemies outside the social sciences, instead of presenting a united front against the arrogance of the earlier intrenched special social sciences, and instead of coöperating with enthusiasm and efficiency to advance the accuracy and volume of sociological researches and publications, the sociologists have too often devoted themselves to disastrous and generally fruitless wrangling and feuds concerning the priority or validity of some particular theoretical phrase, metaphysical assumption, or methodological principle, many of them irrelevant or misleading from the beginning. Prominent sociologists have exhibited more bitterness and hatred towards others of their profession than towards even professors of biblical literature, ethics, Greek or mathematics. This spirit has further promoted the deplorable process of departmental inbreeding. Instead of bringing in men who have been trained under a number of different teachers at diverse universities, there has generally prevailed the practice of appointing men who took their doctorates on the spot. The professors in graduate schools have recruited their subordinates from

among their own graduate students. No Chicago Ph.D.'s were taken into Columbia, or vice-versa. Thus the process of cross-fertilization has been effectively blocked, and discipleship still further promoted.

As a result of these circumstances, it is a lamentable fact that there is no reputable graduate department of sociology in the United States today. I mean by that no department which can compare in number of instructors, personnel, or volume of substantial publications with the competing departments of history, political science and economics. Unquestionably, the best existing department is that at Chicago, but it is only the merest shadow of what it was twenty years ago, when Professor Small was still in his prime, and aided by the vigor and scholarship of his illustrious colleagues, Henderson, Vincent and Thomas. The situation at Chicago is matched elsewhere. The men who founded academic work in sociology in this country are still heads of departments—among them, Giddings, Ross, Hayes, Blackmar, Dealey, Weatherley and Cooley. We owe them an inestimable debt for their pioneer work, but their viewpoints were fixed more than a quarter of a century ago. Because, however, of their priority and personal prestige they still remain, interposing an insuperable obstacle to a reorganization of their departments under men whose attitudes and modes of work reflect thoroughly the contemporary status of sociology. The situation is comparable to that which would exist if Darwin, Romanes, Wallace and Haeckel were still heads of departments of biology in the leading universities. It is rendered all the more menacing because these men, when selecting their successors, tend to choose those who will perpetuate their own viewpoints.

As to the general progress of sociological technique in this country, it has now passed from the earlier stage of magisterial systematization, under Ward, Small, Giddings and Stuckenberg, to various types of specialization. The day of the system builders is past. So rapidly is specialization

being forced upon us that some have even prophesied that the field will be preempted eventually by the special disciplines. Certainly there is now such an increase in the materials available for research that the sociologist is compelled to specialize. As he does so he inevitably tends to assimilate himself to biology, psychology, anthropology, history, or economics.

Meanwhile, historical sociology has not advanced far beyond the state reached thirty years ago in Professor Giddings' justly famous "Principles of Sociology." What has been achieved here has been mainly the work of the Columbia and Harvard schools of anthropologists in the study of primitive cultures and institutions, and the work of social historians, primarily Shotwell, Turner and their students, in surveying the institutional development of Europe and America.

In the study of the geographic factors in society little independent work has been done by sociologists, strictly speaking. The cultivation of human geography has been carried on chiefly by the geographers, particularly by Ratzel's disciple, Miss Semple, by the brilliant theorizer, Ellsworth Huntington, and by the student of regional geography, J. Russell Smith. The critical anthropologists, led by Boas and his disciples, have attempted to evaluate in a discriminating fashion the accumulated mass of anthropogeographical data. But Professor Franklin Thomas has been the only sociologist who has made an effort to digest and expound this work for sociology.

In biological sociology some excellent work has been done by men who have, in general, abandoned the old voluminous speculations about the similarity between society and the biological organism. W. F. Willcox, A. B. Wolfe, W. S. Thompson, E. B. Reuter and others have made special studies of population problems in the light of the developments since Malthus. F. H. Hankins, Carl Kelsey and others have studied the application of the laws of heredity to social problems. Then there have been notable contributions to eugen-

ics and the racial history of man by such social biologists as Raymond Pearl, E. G. Conklin, H. H. Goddard and S. J. Holmes. Some biologists, such as E. M. East, have also made additions to our knowledge of population problems.

In psychological sociology there has been progress away from the philosophic, descriptive and systematizing stage of Cooley, Ross and Giddings toward a competent application of psychological principles to social processes by such writers as L. L. Bernard, F. H. Allport, T. D. Eliot, E. R. Groves, E. D. Martin and Kimball Young. Professors C. A. Ellwood and E. S. Bogardus occupy a position intermediate between the older philosophical systematizers and the inductive students of psychology as applied to society.

A relatively recent approach to social problems from the standpoint of cultural processes and institutional growth has been forwarded chiefly by the cultural anthropologists of the Boas school and a few others, notably Professor Tozzer of Harvard. The only sociologists to devote serious attention to this highly important mode of social analysis have been Professor W. F. Ogburn and his followers, all of whom have derived their orientation from the Boas school of anthropologists.

Probably the largest, and certainly the best paid, group of sociologists are what are usually called social economists or practical sociologists, namely, those chiefly interested in social work and amelioration. In this group well-known personalities are E. T. Devine, S. M. Lindsay, Jane Addams, Graham Taylor, Edith Abbott, Jessica Peixotto, Robert Woods, James Ford and Porter Lee. Here the emphasis has been progressively shifted from amelioration to prevention, though the uplift psychosis is still strong in many quarters.

Especially notable has been the development of the quantitative method in sociology, not only in the special branch of social statistics, but in general. In forwarding this method Professor Giddings must be assigned the place as herald which

is conventionally given to Francis Bacon in the history of scientific thought in general, even if his actual contributions are comparable only to Bacon's scientific achievement in his "*Sylva Sylvarum*."

I have already noted the absence of sociology at Harvard, Cornell, Princeton and the Johns Hopkins. At Yale, Professor A. G. Keller carries on the spirit and doctrines of Sumner, with an able corps of younger men for undergraduate instruction. At Columbia the situation is much as it was twenty years ago, except that Professor Giddings has inevitably lost personal vigor with the passage of time, and Professor Devine has retired from the institution. At Pennsylvania excellent undergraduate instruction is maintained, but nothing of distinction in connection with graduate work. At Brown, Professor Dealey, an industrious disciple of Lester F. Ward, divides his time between sociology and political science. Perhaps the most alert and active department of sociology in the East is that maintained at Dartmouth, but it is restricted almost entirely to undergraduate work. There is a flourishing department of sociology at Smith, with the emphasis placed chiefly on biological factors, social evolution and social legislation.

In the West, the best department is that at Chicago, but there are extensive and growing departments, devoted chiefly to undergraduate instruction, at Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio State, Nebraska, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, and Northwestern. There is nothing of any special note, however, in connection with the work offered in these institutions, unless it be the recent researches of Professor Bernard at Minnesota into the problem of the nature and use of the term instinct, and the systematic work of Professor Ellwood at Missouri in the field of social psychology and the reinterpretation of religion. At Wisconsin the versatile and dynamic personality of Professor E. A. Ross has been diverted lately to a study of political and international prob-

lems. His colleague, Professor J. L. Gillin, has shown remarkable industry in compilations in the field of poverty and criminology. It should be pointed out that the undergraduate registration in sociology is far greater in these mid-western institutions than elsewhere in the country. In some of them the registration runs to more than a thousand, and, in at least one case, to more than two thousand.

In the Far West, while sociological instruction is to be found at Washington, Oregon, and Leland Stanford, the largest and most active department is the one which has been built up by Professor E. S. Bogardus at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. For undergraduate work it is one of the largest and best equipped departments in the country. The unique opportunity to set up a truly great graduate department at the University of California has been frustrated through the opposition of Professor Peixotto and others of the Berkeley faculty. This defect is in part offset by the sociological interests of the unusually competent department of anthropology at California.

In the South there are reputable sociology departments at the Universities of Texas and North Carolina. At Texas there is an unusually alert and intelligent professor, Max S. Handman, while the group at North Carolina, led by Professor Howard W. Odum, constitutes one of the most progressive and enthusiastic departments in the country. Among other things, it publishes what is unquestionably the best sociological journal now issued anywhere in the world.

In addition to these university and college departments of sociology there are many Schools of Social Work, designed to train persons for this profession. Of these, perhaps the most famous is the New York School of Social Work, formerly the New York School of Philanthropy. An especially notable innovation was embodied in the Smith College School for Psychiatric Social Work, founded in 1917, with the aim of putting social work primarily upon

a psychiatric basis, thus closely interrelating mental hygiene and sociology. There should also be mentioned the many research foundations established to aid sociologists in the investigation of such problems as population growth, heredity and mental and social defects, education, and the causes of delinquency.

As to the periodicals dealing with sociological problems in this country, there are three devoted specifically to the subject—the *American Journal of Sociology*, published at the University of Chicago under the editorship of Professor Small; the *Journal of Social Forces*, published at the University of North Carolina under the editorship of Professor Odum; and the *Journal of Applied Sociology*, edited at the University of Southern California by Professor Bogardus. Of these, the *American Journal of Sociology* carries perhaps the best array of relatively long monographic articles, but its former excellent book review section has now degenerated into what amounts for all practical purposes to the merest drivel, though its bibliographic classification is very helpful. A much wider range of topics is dealt with in the *Journal of Social Forces*, and this periodical is also the only one in which attention is given to the adequate reviewing of current sociological literature. The *Journal of Applied Sociology* contains many excellent brief articles, but makes no pretense at thorough reviewing, and is in no sense an addition to the more scholarly aspects of the science of society. A number of other journals publish material closely related to sociology, among them, the *American Anthropologist*, the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, the *Political Science Quarterly* and *Mental Hygiene*. Of these, the most important and valuable for sociologists is the last mentioned. This is a comprehensive and substantial quarterly, edited by Dr. Frankwood E. Williams and published by the National Mental Hygiene Committee. It contains valuable articles in each issue on the application of modern psychology and biology to social problems.

HIRED MEN

BY MARY ALDEN HOPKINS

WHEN we New Englanders were an agricultural people, soon after pioneer days, our smartest young men went into agriculture. They hired themselves out to neighboring farmers, worked hard, and, if tradition may be trusted, saved their wages. Some of them used these savings to buy uncleared land. Others bought cattle. Others went to Andover to study for the ministry or to Bowdoin to become lawyers.

A pretty picture has been handed down to us of high hopes, hard work, and pleasant, deserved achievement. Jacob Abbott portrays in the "Rollo" books a marvelous hired man named Jonas, who absorbed wisdom like a sponge and gave it out like a fountain. I have, too, the shadowy memory of another hired man in Abbott literature who paused under a window to listen to the farmer's remarks on cautiousness, addressed to his young son, and went on his way murmuring, "Think, think, think; then act!"

Now that we New Englanders are no longer an agricultural people, better openings for our worthy youths offer themselves in commerce, industry and transportation. The Jonases of today go into the stores, factories and offices of the towns rather than on to the land. Their places have been taken by men from Italy, Russia and Czecho-Slovakia. These men save their wages and buy the farms which were supposed to be worn out. The ancient New England acres, our disturbed eyes inform us, are now green beneath the feet of immigrant owners. The Puritan farmer and his farmhand have almost disappeared.

A peculiar phase of this change is that

these Slavic and Latin farmers have taken over with the acres a residue of elderly farmhands, many from pioneer stock. The incongruous relationship interests me as I watch it in the section of Connecticut where I live. The patriarchal make-up of the immigrant household lends itself to the arrangement, absorbing any number of conflicting personalities. The pride of the native hired man is soothed by his belief in his Nordic superiority, and his ego is fed by his greater ease in the language and customs of the country. The immigrant employer, on the other hand, looks down on him from the vantage point of a man of property. Each feels superior to the other.

These unsuccessful old men, who have never attained land or families of their own, are all damaged in one way or another—mainly in the spirit. They have no families of their own. They are content to live in other men's households, shifting from one farm to another to evade the difficulties of even slight domestic adjustment. The existence of their forebears has become too hard for them. They have declined to assault life gallantly. Yet in their retreat from the struggle they have developed strange and variegated individualities.

These old men who plow other men's fields, eat at other men's tables, and cut willow whistles for other men's children, never face even their own failure. They retreat from reality into fantasy. Just as other men who cannot look at themselves as they really exist are prone to escape their chagrin in bustling activity, money making, philosophy, or the cultural cov-