perial residence, its ministries and its parliament house. Tokyo Imperial University occupies an important site in Tokyo, and other institutions of higher education and research occupy additional fitting localities in Tokyo and Yokohama. Here are Tokyo University of Engineering, the corresponding technological college in Yokohama, the famous research institute of physics and chemistry, the equally famous earthquake research institute, the extensive research laboratories of the Ministry of Communications, the Ministry of Railways and of other Ministries (certain of which do work similar to that of our own Bureau of Standards). The headquarters of meteorological research are located here, although the major meteorological work is carried on at the Kobe site, under the eye of Director Horiguti. Tokyo is also the home of Waseda University and other universities depending on private endowments for their support, in most of which science is given a fitting place.

It is impracticable to enumerate all the important research laboratories which the government and the various Japanese industries support in this area. The area is one of great intellectual effort in science, with achievements that are in keeping with the excellence of the facilities provided. Altogether, Tokyo is a center of culture to which western scientists might well give more serious attention; and which western students in science might fruitfully visit for observation and study, except for the inconvenience of a language in which the structure differs so radically from any western language in both its spoken and written forms. This difficulty, however, is softened by the fact that most of the cultured Japanese are somewhat familiar with the English language and many are facile in their use of English.

Japan is deeply affected by the electric forces set up by industrialization, which forces draw people into increasingly populous urban areas; and the Japanese people are now at a disadvantage because their government is mostly in the hands of men who thus far have had little personal experience in dealing with those forces or in moulding their influences. Education in science seems to possess a satisfactory status of independence and liberality, but a disturbing aspect is arising which affects philosophical and historical scholarship. Comprehensive scholarship in historical, ethnological and archeological fields is still in a germinal stage in the Japanese universities, and efforts to fertilize its development along investigational lines are frowned on from some official circles. This situation has analogies to the situation in America sixty years ago when, in theology, the "higher criticism" was in its early stages; except that the situation is more serious in Japan because it is official efforts at repression that there invade the privileges of the universities to investigate freely and to express developed opinions openly. An independent newspaper published in Japan recently expressed the situation editorially in the words, "These are days when orthodoxy is very nervous and freedom is looked upon as a rather regrettable principle to have been adopted," referring to freedom of thought and opinion in religion and politics. Remembering that "he who keeps the hills, burns the wood," the situation is one for great concern in all scholarly circles. As yet it does not seem to have brought restraint into the circles of the physical sciences, but western experience has shown that the scholarly pursuit of learning in every branch is ultimately affected disadvantageously when forcible restraint is applied to the pursuit of truth in any of the learned branches. On account of the well-demonstrated wisdom of the Japanese people, there is good ground for hope that the disturbing effort at restraint on freedom of research and the discussion of results will blow over, as it did in America, before great permanent harm has resulted.

# THE SPIRIT OF WARD IN SOCIOLOGY[1]

By Professor STUART A. RICE

CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD; PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA (ON LEAVE)

WHEN Dr. Wells suggested my topic, "The Spirit of Ward in Sociology," I did not quite know how to deal with it. Later, it occurred to me that perhaps the topic held a deeper significance than either he or I had appreciated. We of this generation of sociologists are trying to build a science of sociology. Science as it is known in the physical world—I do not want to exclude the social world from the domain of science—evolves by a slow accretion of knowledge. Science *grows*, bit by bit, each brick in the structure being laid upon the bricks which were laid before. Some-

[1] Remarks as guest speaker at the founding of the Lester F. Ward Sociological Society of The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., on April 16, 1936.

times, of course, whole wings of the building are abandoned but that does not detract from the general view of science as a slow and orderly accretion.

Now social science—I will use the terms "sociology" and "social science" interchangeably in this context—has been a field of discussion since Aristotle. But has it been science, in the sense I have just described? I think we would agree that it has not. I think that right up to our own day sociologists, for example, have been distinguished for their influence upon the ideals, the philosophy, the points of view, of their time and place, and not for their contributions to *knowledge,* in a scientific sense. It has been their "spirit," in other words, rather than their scientific contribution, that has been noteworthy. This has been true of Ward no less and no more than of Giddings, who differed in view-point so widely from Ward, and whose spiritual contribution consisted so greatly in its emphasis upon the need in sociology for the development of science through measurement.

It is, therefore, appropriate to speak of the *spirit* of Ward in sociology. It would not be so appropriate —I think it would sound peculiar in your ears—to speak of the spirit of Ward in geology or paleontology, to which subjects he made—we have just been informed—definite scientific contributions.

I am always a little hesitant when I talk about the work of the great sociologists of the past, for I am not by inclination destructive. Each of them builds up a philosophical system, and then the commentator who follows is expected to step in and shatter the system. I feel a little like two gentlemen last winter when the weather was cold. They were persons of leisure—I might call them "men about town"—and they did not have overcoats. They were passing the Art Museum, and decided to go in and look at the statuary as a means of whiling away the hours until the doors of their municipal lodgings should be open for the evening. Successfully passing the attendant at the door, our critics ventured down the corridor and presently came to a stop before a replica of the Venus de Milo. They looked at it sharply, and then, with alarm, at each other. "Bo," said one, "we'd better be gettin' out of here quick before somebody says we done it!"

As befits an uneasy task, I presume I should attempt as quickly as possible to sum up Ward's spiritual legacy as I see it. I should say in the first place that his influence has not been limited to sociology. It has had a profound effect on current thought. Without attempt at an erudition concerning his influence that I have had no opportunity to acquire, I should say that he has aided in the establishment of a belief in the possibility of purposeful social self-control. There is much about us here in Washington to-day which we might attribute to Ward and which is at least in conformity with his thinking. The present Administration assumes the possibility of purposeful social self-control, and any administration which follows this one can not avoid attempting to do very much the same sort of things to which the present Administration is committed. Any government, any system of society, at this time and place in the world's history, is compelled to make and act upon such an assumption. From this standpoint, Ward's faith in the possibility of "telesis" takes on something of a prophetic cast.

The previous speaker, Dr. Stanton, has noted what seems to me a very significant thing about Ward's personal history. He was not primarily a sociologist but a botanist, geologist and paleontologist. In these latter capacities he had a place in the Government Service; but as a sociologist he was compelled to function outside of the Government Service. As a sociologist in Washington he was "on his own," and he finally left governmental employ to extend his sociological interests in a university, where his intellectual and vocational activities might coincide. To-day the reverse is true. Men are coming from the social science departments of the universities to the government. That reversal in the direction of migration among sociologists between Ward's day and ours is a measure of the changes that have taken place in our subject.

The sociology of Ward's day, as I have said, was philosophy, and sociology has since remained very largely philosophical. It is nevertheless in the process of becoming scientific. That process has involved a breaking up of the cosmical grandeur of the subject. It is being resolved into a diversity of specific problems, having sufficiently small dimension for individuals to grapple with them. It is because the cosmical philosophies of the Ward and Spencer generation have been broken down in our day into concrete and manageable units of investigation that social scientists are being called from the universities into the government. This applies not only to the Federal Government, but to state, municipal, business and organizational activities. This kind of sociological activity has brought to Washington from the universities perhaps 30 or more sociologists and a considerably larger number of economists and statisticians. Theirs is the kind of social science out of which accretions to scientific knowledge will come. From it likewise will come, eventually, new generalizations on the grand scale, as in physical science. I agree with my good friend Ellwood that we need a new social philosophy, but I do not agree with him as to how we are going to get it. We will resynthesize our social philosophy out of the specific,

concrete, factual kinds of study to which Park refers in the letter we have heard, and these factual studies will relate to pressing social problems that our present society must try to solve. On this latter point Professor Ellwood and I would probably agree.

I have tried to indicate that we are in the process of change from a sociology in which it would be appropriate to speak of the *spirit* of sociologists to one in which it is appropriate to speak of their *contributions*. In this process, sociology and the other social sciences are encountering the pains of transition that normally accompany growth anywhere. The social philosopher does not have to put his theories to the test; he can take the whole cosmos as his field of speculation, but he is not called upon to check up and verify with statistical indexes and representative samples. Science, on the other hand, does have to be verified, to be checked up, and it is often very uncomfortable when our work is checked up. Moreover, sociologists are being called upon to deal with extremely practical problems when their training has been of a type regarded by many as impractical or idealistic.

During my past three years in Washington I have developed a view-point concerning the rôle of academic people in the economic, sociological and statistical agencies of the government. New problems are all about us—problems that have to be solved and dealt with in new ways. To solve and deal with them, theoretically trained persons with disciplined minds are required. Yet it is said that the university man and the academic man are not practical. There is a large measure of truth in this criticism for the reason that I have mentioned—their training has been exclusively along theoretical lines. They have not learned to wrestle with commonplace realities, many of which still survive in the situations to be dealt with. On the other hand, there is no one more impractical than the so-called "practical" man, when the conditions to which the latter has been accustomed are undergoing change. Typically, he is unable either to comprehend or to grapple with the altered conditions, and continues a futile attempt to apply his time-honored rules-of-thumb when these are no longer applicable. The point to the paradox is that the academic man has something that the practical man can not supply, but he also lacks something realistic that the so-called "practical" man has. In recruiting technical personnel for the government service, it has been my experience that good mental qualities and thorough theoretical training are only part of the required qualifications. The other part is that a candidate shall be able to "find his way around" in the workaday realities of the daily tasks assigned him.

There is another point at which it seems to me that the deeper implications of Ward's faith in purposeful social self-control are at variance with the actual effects up to date of his ideology. The notion of *telesis* is essential to the theories of those who would reorganize society along new and allegedly better lines. Ward is thus a patron saint of social radicals. On the other hand, the demands of *social planning*—to employ a more current term—are such as to produce a classification of people in accordance with their ability to make the social organism function, rather than in accordance with their emotional desires for a preservation or a reordering of the social structure.

If I may again be personal, three years in Washington have given me a very different concept of the way in which people should be classified for practical purposes. When I was a small boy, I inferred that people were naturally divided into Republicans and Democrats, until I learned that there were also Socialists and "other lesser breeds without the law." Later on, in the university, I discovered that Democrats and Republicans were not realistic divisions of mankind, and I began to think of people as conservatives or radicals, irrespective of party. In more recent years I find that I have lost much of my former interest in this classification. I have come to think of persons as classified according to their ability to think and act intelligently, competently and precisely in realistic situations. Whether they are capitalists or socialists does not seem to me as important as it used to, for those terms refer to idealogies that have no immediate significance in 98 per cent. of the situations encountered in the real world. What difference do these idealogies make, as compared with the individual's capacity or incapacity to do the job in hand competently? The great lack under any kind of social organization, capitalistic, fascistic or communistic, will always be that of competent men and women, having ability to do the day's work and to manage the complexities of organization that are bound to exist. As long as inventions continue, society, under whatever form of organization, will become more and more complex, and its functions will become more and more difficult to coordinate and direct. Hence, we will need more and more to have scientifically trained, practically minded leaders, to carry on the practical job of enabling society to function under whatever system you please. These leaders, whether known by the name or not, will have to be social scientists if they are to be effective. There will never be enough people who are capable of making the social organization run. Ward's spirit is of assistance here, for he has helped to give us confidence that we can organize and control society collectively and make it work; and by such working bring about a progressively higher level of human satisfactions.