

# American SOCIOLOGICAL Review

February  
1943

Volume 8  
Number 1



## SOCIOLOGY A MEANS TO DEMOCRACY\*

DWIGHT SANDERSON

*Cornell University*

EVENTS OF the past decade have challenged the validity of our former naive faith in democracy. The Axis Powers seek to subjugate democracy and to establish the supremacy of the "superman" and the "super-race." This has forced a new interpretation of our concept of democracy, and the search for its true meaning has resulted in an extensive literature, comparable to that of the late eighteenth century. We have come to see that it is a much broader concept than political freedom, universal suffrage and parliamentary government; that it is not a matter of mere social structure which can ever be perfectly attained, but that it must be conceived as a process toward an ideal relationship which will evolve in the future as it has in the past; that it rests primarily upon our attitudes toward others, and is fundamentally a faith in a desirable system of human relationships.

### I. WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

It is not my intention to attempt any definition or extended discussion of democracy, for that has been done adequately by others.<sup>1</sup> I

\* Presidential address prepared for the Thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society before the meeting was cancelled December 1942.

<sup>1</sup> Among some of the more important recent books on this are: Carl Becker, *Modern Democracy*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941; Charles E. Merriam, *The New Democracy and the New Despotism*, New York, Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939, and *What Is Democracy?*,

merely present the point of view from which I wish to discuss the role of Sociology and the need for its more effective organization as a means to promote the democratic process.

In the past, and too largely in the present, our ideas of democracy have been almost exclusively in the political realm. Leaders of thought are now fairly well agreed that today political democracy is almost impossible without a larger degree of economic democracy. President Roosevelt has given recognition to this by including "freedom from want" in his Four Freedoms.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of World War I, Liberty Hyde Bailey wrote a little book—*What Is Democracy*—which answers this question with an insight prophetic of the views being expressed today:

Democracy is primarily a sentiment—a sentiment of personality. It is the expression of the feeling that every person, whatever his birth or occupation, shall develop the ability and have the opportunity to take part. Its motive is individualism on the one hand and voluntary pub-

Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941; and John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture*, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939.

<sup>2</sup> See Carl Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 64, who says that the essential task which confronts all democratic societies today is "how in practice to curtail the freedom of the individual in economic enterprise sufficiently to effect the equality of opportunity and of possessions without which democracy is an empty form, and at the same time to preserve that measure of individual freedom in intellectual and political life without which it cannot exist."

lic service on the other—the welfare and development of the individual and of all individuals. . . .

If the person is to be placed in the most advantageous conditions and environment, so will he desire a similar privilege for his neighbor and voluntarily assume the responsibility of which I speak. The yielding of advantage to another, the giving up of granted "rights," that another may have larger life, are in the very essence of the democratic state.

Responsibility, not freedom, is the key in democracy—responsibility for one's self, for the good of the neighbor, for the welfare of the Demos. Until every citizen feels this responsibility as an inescapable personal obligation, there is no complete democracy. . . .

I find the root of democracy in spiritual religion rather than in political freedom or organized industrial efficiency. Democracy is a spiritual power or product of a people.<sup>3</sup>

These two principles of the supreme worth of the individual person and of his responsibility for participating in activities for the common welfare, are being repeatedly expressed by the best thinkers of today.<sup>4</sup>

Thus democracy is not merely a system of social organization, but it is a moral issue and essentially a religious faith.<sup>5</sup> It is a faith in a

<sup>3</sup> L. H. Bailey, *What Is Democracy?* Published by L. H. Bailey, The Comstock Publishing Co., Agents, Ithaca, N.Y., 1918, pp. 36-42. (Out of print, but deserves reprinting.)

<sup>4</sup> The first of Merriam's five principal assumptions of democracy is: "The essential dignity of man, the importance of protecting and cultivating his personality on a fraternal rather than a differential principle, and the elimination of special privileges based upon unwarranted or exaggerated emphasis on the human differentials." The responsibility for participation is in his fourth principle: "The desirability of popular decision in the last analysis on basic questions of social direction and policy, and of recognized procedures for the expression of such decisions and their validation in policy." Charles E. Merriam, *The New Despotism and the New Democracy*, p. 11.

Says Harry Emerson Fosdick: "To tell people they can do as they please, to give them in democracy free speech, free press, free assembly, is not the solution of the problem. That is the problem. No other way of life so much as democracy calls for intelligence, character and moral responsibility inside the citizen."

<sup>5</sup> Says John Dewey: "We have to see that democracy means the belief that humanistic culture should prevail; we should be frank and open in our recog-

better way of life whose realization depends upon the behavior of each individual. Its ethics are essentially those of Christianity and involve religious values, as has recently been pointed out by Ordway Tead<sup>6</sup> and many others.

Democracy is not merely a system of social organization peculiar to government or even to the world of industry and business, but involves all phases of life, if one accepts the democratic ideology completely.

Democracy is being forced upon us in all areas of life because we find that it is the only means whereby we can satisfactorily promote the general welfare and can attain the highest human values. Political democracy arose out of the failure of feudalism to compete with the rising power of the bourgeoisie in commerce and manufactures. The Machine Age and the modern corporation with the centralization of financial control are forcing the issue of a larger democracy in the economic world.<sup>7</sup> The growth of the cooperative movement, a new form of economic democracy, was stimulated by the overlarge cost of distribution from producer to consumer. Modern democracy in the Christian church began with the Protestant Reformation as a revolt against ecclesiastical corruption, but although desiring freedom and autonomy Protestantism has yet to demonstrate its responsibility in united action. In the school the rule of the rod is giving way, as a result of better knowledge of the psychology of learning, and because schools cannot rear good citizens by precept but must teach through active participation in a democratic school society. Even in the family, the stronghold of paternal authority, the absence of the father from the home in cities and the inability of parents to control their children through the old ordering and forbidding techniques, are forcing a more democratic organization.

—  
 nition that the proposition is a moral one—like any idea which concerns what *should* be." John Dewey, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

<sup>6</sup> Ordway Tead, *Religious Values and the Democratic Faith*, The Booklist, April 1, 1942. Reprinted by the American Library Association.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Adolf A. Berle, Jr. and Gardiner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1933.

Thus in various areas of life democracy has developed as a response to the exigencies of new social situations. Equally important has been the seminal influence of the Christian doctrine of the supreme worth of the individual man, which is being upheld by the findings of psychology, sociology and philosophy. "The spirit of man is the greatest thing in this spacious world."<sup>8</sup>

## II. THE CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIOLOGY

With this background as to the meaning and growth of democracy we now approach the heart of our topic—what contribution has sociology made to democracy and how may it function best to advance it in the future?

We must, of course, remember that democracy is essentially a philosophy of life and no mere mechanism. Gurvitch<sup>9</sup> is right when he says that "the sociological analysis of the problem of democracy can contribute to practical conclusions to the degree that the results of a purely sociological description are approached with criteria from the philosophy of democracy"; but it should be added that it is this sociological description which is essential for implementing democracy.

That sociology has had a profound influence on the leaders of American thought during the last half century needs no proof. This has been not alone through the direct and indirect effect of teaching thousands of college students but by educating the general public through the press in the significance of the role of groups in modern society.

Before an audience of sociologists it is almost superfluous to recount the results of sociological research that affect our understanding of the factors which promote or in-

<sup>8</sup> John Buchan, *Mr. Standfast*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919, p. 263.

<sup>9</sup> Georges Gurvitch, "Democracy as a Sociological Problem," *Journal of Legal and Political Sociology*, I: 71, October, 1942. The first number of this new journal came to hand after this paper was completed and is significant in that it deals with the same problem of "Democracy and Social Structure." It is full of interesting points bearing on our problem, but to my mind its best example of the value of sociological description as a means to democracy is in the paper of Kingsley Davis, "Political Ambivalence in Latin America," pp. 127-150.

hibit democracy, but it is worth while to consider the importance of a few of the more significant findings.

1. *The Social Self*. Sociology and social psychology (for my present purpose I do not distinguish between them) have shown that human personality is the product of social relations,<sup>10</sup> that we are interdependent, and that the welfare of each is conditioned by the welfare of all.

This means that without participation in group life there can be no adequate socialization, which is an indispensable foundation of democracy.

2. *Status*. Our research on group life, classes and castes has revealed some of the reasons men support one another to obtain and maintain preferred social and economic status, which may advance or retard democracy.

3. *The Social Heritage*. Sociological analysis has shown the power of custom and tradition, how the folkways and the mores<sup>11</sup> tend to fix human attitudes in the forms of the past, and how institutions and the trend toward institutionalization establish vested interests, all of which explains the resistance to new ideologies and social inventions.<sup>12</sup> It has revealed the power and value of the cultural or social heritage.

4. *Cultural Lag*. Knowledge of these factors has revealed what Ogburn<sup>13</sup> calls "Cultural Lag," and why we are increasingly controlled by our rapidly changing material environment. "For all the physical features of the present regime of production and distribution of goods and services are products of the new physical science," says Dewey, "while the distinctively *human* consequences of science are still determined by the habits and beliefs established before its origin."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See particularly the writings of Charles H. Cooley, James Mark Baldwin and George H. Mead.

<sup>11</sup> William Graham Sumner, Boston, Ginn and Co., 1906; and a recent example—Thurman W. Arnold, *The Folklore of Capitalism*, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1937.

<sup>12</sup> Cf., Dwight Sanderson, "What Prevents Social Progress?" *Scientific Monthly*, XL, pp. 349-359, April, 1935.

<sup>13</sup> William Fielding Ogburn, *Social Change*, New York, B. W. Huesch, Inc., 1923.

<sup>14</sup> John Dewey, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

5. *Social Order.* Sociological research has also indicated the nature and means of social control; that some form of social order—social organization—is essential for a human way of life. Otherwise man would be only a predatory animal, as he sometimes is; for the “superman” and the “super-race” of the Nazis are pathological. Indeed, one of the primary findings of sociology is that human relations are controlled not wholly by a political government,<sup>15</sup> but through the social control of the various groups to which individuals belong and of the culture in which they are born. Furthermore, it is because of this social order that the behavior of social groups is, under given conditions, sufficiently repetitive to be predictable and consequently subject to scientific analysis.

6. *Population.* Sociology has led the way in studies of population growth and decline, of its distribution and shifts, and how changes in composition as to age, sex, marital status, nativity, occupation, etc., affect the given social situation, all of which are fundamental in planning for a larger democracy.

7. *Race.* Sociologists have also led in studies of race relations and of measures for racial adjustment—problems which today are swaying world politics.<sup>16</sup> Democracy cannot exclude the colored races. The doctrine of white supremacy is as undemocratic and untenable as the Nazi myth of Nordic superiority.

8. *Sociology Applied.* The usefulness of these findings of sociology for understanding what democracy is and how it may be achieved has already been demonstrated by their application to the solution of current social problems such as delinquency and crime, poverty, and family relationships. Sociology and psychology have given the foundation for the whole system of social welfare work, private and public, which has done so much to improve the condition of those disadvantaged by the rapidly changing and increasingly complex social environ-

ment of modern life. The growth of techniques of group work as a social therapy has been largely an outgrowth of sociological research.

These new insights into the organization and processes of human society have profoundly affected the thinking of those who have been exposed to them—the intelligentsia, but only to a slight extent have they influenced the thought and attitudes of the masses. They are, however, being publicized by the press and the radio and are penetrating the content and methods of school curricula, even in the elementary schools. The social studies in the secondary schools are too largely dominated by history<sup>17</sup> and government which are remote from the immediate life of the child and are largely abstractions to him. To follow recognized pedagogical principles the social studies in our schools should begin with a study of the group life in the child's immediate environment which conditions his behavior. When this is done more adequately, and the group life of children in and outside the school is directed to develop democratic participation, as is being promoted by the Progressive Education Movement, we shall have a much wider appreciation of sociology and it will have a larger sphere of influence.

### III. SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY

Granting the contribution of sociology, is it not true that it is largely an analysis of society as it is? Of what use can sociology be in shaping policies in a rapidly changing environment? Can it effectively promote the *growth* of democracy? Democracy involves freedom of the masses from the control of the few with opportunity but also with responsibility for all. It has seemed that this was natural and easy when primitive society consisted of small groupings such as the family, village, or local tribe, although as a matter of fact even in such simple societies democracy was achieved but gradually out of the conflict of individual interests with

<sup>15</sup> Cf., A. W. Small, *Origins of Sociology*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1924.

<sup>16</sup> As reported by Wendell Willkie in his radio address of October 26, 1942. On this see also the *Survey Graphic* of November, 1942.

<sup>17</sup> Cf., Charles H. Cooley, “A Primary Culture for Democracy,” *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, XIII: 5-8, 1910.

those of the general welfare,<sup>18</sup> but it is much more difficult to attain when modern communication makes the world more interdependent, and the need for aggregations of capital for the support of modern machinery and technology requires a necessary centralization of power for its management. "Like it or not," says Becker, "the complexities of a highly integrated technological civilization are carrying us in a certain direction, that is to say, away from freedom of the individual in economic enterprise and toward an extension of social control."<sup>19</sup>

If men are now to have democracy, it would seem obvious that they must have a knowledge of the structure and processes of society if they are to build a society in which they will assume responsibility for its intelligent control.<sup>20</sup> To furnish such knowledge is the sphere of sociology, as well as of the other social sciences.

Sociology is slowly building the foundations of a knowledge of the structure of society, but there are a score of basic problems related to the establishment and maintenance of democracy which now challenge its most intensive research and ablest thought. Let me suggest a few examples:

1. *Centralization.* One of the most crucial problems is—how can we have centralization of power and yet maintain autonomy of local groups? This involves the structure and function of federations of all sorts, with regard to the domination of executive or mana-

<sup>18</sup> Dwight Sanderson, *The Rural Community*, Boston, Ginn and Co., 1932, p. 289.

<sup>19</sup> Carl Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 84. See also, Robert S. Lynd, "The Structure of Power," *The New Republic*, 107: 597-600, November 9, 1942, this being an abridgement of the author's Foreword to Professor John A. Brady's *Business as a System of Power* to be published in January, 1943, by the Columbia University Press.

<sup>20</sup> "The first need is to recognize that a free country, in this increasingly complex world, can not exist, let alone find satisfaction, without being self-conscious, and all the agencies of public opinion must be moulded to this end. A self-conscious society would be one in which every individual comprehended the aims of society, his own part in the whole, the possibilities of intellectual, artistic and moral satisfaction open to him, his role in the collective knowledge and will."—Julian Sorell Huxley, "Science, Natural and Social," *The Scientific Monthly*, L: 16, January, 1940.

gerial<sup>21</sup> control. It concerns not only domination in government, as between the nation, the state and the local community, but in all types of national organizations, in whatever phase of human association. Time permitting it might be shown that it is a problem common to all national or regional organizations, that it is as difficult in centralized cooperative associations, religious denomination boards, and trade unions, as in national or state government. To what extent are local units dominated by the policies promulgated by state or national organization officials? Is a healthy autonomy of local units essential for the democratic process?<sup>22</sup>

2. *Is Discussion Essential?* Under present conditions, can the establishment of new institutions be left safely to invention by experts and administrative fiat, or should they be based on a general conviction through discussion if they are to be stable? With frequent crises resulting from the rapid advance of technology, can democracy act efficiently or must we depend more on administrative or executive control? Can we have time for discussion and the development of an informed public opinion? If so, how?

3. *The Role of the Expert.* From this arises the whole problem of the use of the expert in relation to democratic control, as so well introduced by Lindeman<sup>23</sup> some years ago.

4. *Participation and Socialization.* Inasmuch as we have seen that individual responsibility is necessary for the maintenance of any form of democracy, how may this be attained in whatever sphere of association is involved? For here again, this is a problem not only of participation and responsibility in government, but is equally a problem in all areas of human association. It is equally the *bête noire* of trade unions, centralized cooperative associations, and religious bodies.

<sup>21</sup> For suggestive leads on this topic, see James Burnham, *The Managerial Revolution*, New York, The John Day Co., Inc., 1941, a rather extreme presentation, but pointing out a definite tendency.

<sup>22</sup> Cf., M. P. Follett, *The New State*, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1918.

<sup>23</sup> Eduard C. Lindeman, *Social Discovery*, Republic Publishing Co., 1924, pp. 262-272.

To answer this question will require many more studies of the effects of participation in various groups, of the interrelation of participation in different associations, and how participation may be stimulated, for it is the asocial individual who has few group associations, the one who is not socialized, who impedes democracy in any area of association.

5. *Classes*. Can classes be abolished, as has been the dream of social revolutionaries, or are they inevitable? If so, how do they arise, how are they maintained, and how may vertical mobility be ensured and encouraged? Sociology has only commenced the study of the phenomena of classes.

6. *Group Analysis*. Are groups, particularly pressure groups, what they seem to be, or to what extent is their assumed power largely fictitious? Does the mass of the membership of any national group really stand for the principles announced by its official leaders, and to what extent will it support their pronouncements? This is a very practical question as affecting the behavior of congressman or of representatives in any national body. Although Allport<sup>24</sup> may have been somewhat extreme in his denial of reality to the group, there is no question that we have too often tended to reify the group in a manner which its behavior does not support. There is room for a wholesome debunking of the popular conception of large groups. A clearer understanding of the actual relations in them and a larger emphasis on the responsibility of the local group would greatly strengthen democracy.

7. *The Sociology of Business and Industry* has been too long neglected. Who has made any adequate analysis of the sociology of corporations,<sup>25</sup> a problem which is basic for the survival of democracy?<sup>26</sup> Nor have

we given adequate attention to the sociology of labor relations and trade unions, but have left this field largely to the economists and psychologists. I welcome the section on The Relation of Sociology to Business and Industry at this meeting, a result of the presidential address of Henry Pratt Fairchild in 1936, and also the joint programs with the American Association for Labor Legislation, as steps in this direction. Students of business administration are attacking this field from various angles,<sup>27</sup> but thorough sociological analysis is also needed. A similar case could be made for the sociology of religion.

8. *Leadership*. Lastly we have the whole subject of the relation of leadership to democracy, an essentially sociological problem in which we have made only a beginning in our analysis, and which is intimately related to the last topic. The advance of democracy in every field of human association will depend primarily upon leadership and we need a new conception of the sociology of the relationships involved.<sup>28</sup>

9. *Evaluation of Democracy*. The synthesis of research on many of these problems will be involved in the final problem of evaluating democracy as a social process. Social science cannot ensure acceptance of democracy, for it is based on moral attitudes and beliefs, but it can determine

---

strains men and all their institutions to work the will of the minority who hold and wield economic power."

<sup>27</sup> See T. N. Whitehead, *Leadership in a Free Society*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1937.

<sup>28</sup> "Society, for example, is in bitter need of better mechanisms for selecting its leaders, the individuals who will play the dominant role in the social gradient, as the brain and receptor cells exercise physiological leadership in our own bodies. When proper leaders—men qualified by talent and training for the duties demanded in the position of social leadership—can be selected by devices which are more dependable and objective than are the accidents of family, rhetoric, ambition and other circumstances which today frequently toss undesirable individuals to the apex of the power pyramid, I believe the most serious of the world's afflictions will have been conquered."—R. W. Gerard, "Higher Levels of Integration," in Robert Redfield, ed., *Levels of Integration in Biological and Social Systems*, Lancaster, Pa., The Jacques Cattell Press, 1942, p. 84.

<sup>24</sup> Floyd H. Allport, "The Group Fallacy in Relation to Social Science," *American Journal of Sociology*, XXIX: 688-703, May, 1924.

<sup>25</sup> Berle and Means, *op. cit.*, have given important leads for this, although not indicating their sociological significance.

<sup>26</sup> Cf., Robert S. Lynd, *loc. cit.*, who says: "Liberal democracy has never dared face the fact that industrial capitalism is an actively coercive form of organization of society that cumulatively con-

whether it is efficient in meeting its avowed aims and objectives, and thus strengthen our faith by proving what in it is true and what is spurious. Beginnings in such an objective evaluation of democracy have already been made by Lewin, Lippitt, and White<sup>29</sup> in their study of the democratic versus the autocratic organization of student groups.

#### IV. METHOD AND PROCEDURE

It seems obvious from the above that there are numerous fields in which sociological research and teaching are essential for giving men an understanding of the social forces involved in the democratizing of society. It is, indeed, encouraging that the demand for the application of social science to current social problems is coming most vigorously from many of the leaders in the physical and biological sciences.

With this opportunity and responsibility facing us there are some points with regard to procedure which warrant our attention.

1. *Definition of Concepts.* If sociology is to make fundamental contributions to the urgent demand that science be applied to the complex problems of human relations which now face us in realizing our faith in democracy, then it must use the established methods of science. It must know the phenomena with which it is concerned, and by scientific analysis give new knowledge concerning them. The phenomena of sociology are the forms of human association. Its task is to describe those forms of human association that are sufficiently recurrent under given conditions to make the behavior of human collectivities predictable. We are no longer worried as to whether these phenomena are *real* things or entities, for recent advances in physics and chemistry have made clear that the phenomena with which they deal are not material things but are concepts of natural processes, and their advances have been in the discovery and refinement of these concepts. The chief difference is that their phenomena are more exactly meas-

urable and can be more precisely controlled under given conditions so as to test the validity of their concepts through experiment.

In the physical and biological sciences there is, however, some essential agreement as to their basic concepts. What would happen if there were no agreement as to the essential nature of atoms, molecules or organic cells, or how could the biological sciences have advanced if Linnaeus had not invented the binomial system of nomenclature with taxonomic descriptions so that there is reasonable certainty of the identity of a given organism? Yet in sociology we have little agreement upon the nature of the phenomena which are our most common concepts. What is a group or an institution about which we talk so glibly? Few sociologists agree and we have made no serious attempt to establish what we mean by these and a hundred other terms. Consequently we are unable to understand one another, and the public is bewildered by our maze of jargon. Until we can come to some agreement as to the nature of the fundamental phenomena with which we are dealing, there is little probability of any rapid advance in the *science* of sociology. As in any other science there must first be a working agreement as to the elements involved in the phenomena with which we deal, so that by thorough description we may reveal verifiable relationships which were previously unknown. Otherwise we are not advancing science, however valuable our common sense observations may be, for the merit of science is that through analysis it reveals hitherto unknown relationships. Otherwise chemistry would still be alchemy. Sociology is still too much in what Comte called the metaphysical stage, and we are too intent on saving society to patiently do the work necessary to discover the nature of the phenomena with which we deal. So I plead for our coming to grips with the problem of establishing some consensus with regard to our nomenclature, not that this can be permanently settled or will remain static any more than it has in the physical and biological sciences.

<sup>29</sup> Kurt Lewin, R. Lippitt, and R. K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10: 271-299, May, 1939.

2. *Research Primary.* For the reason that sociology has so few well established techniques for measuring or describing its phenomena, I doubt the wisdom of placing a major emphasis upon the collaboration of the various social sciences in the solution of current social problems, and would devote much larger resources to building up a truly scientific knowledge of the subject matter. Social problems must be dealt with, and the social sciences should cooperate in contributing all they can to their solution, but there will be little discovery of fundamentally new knowledge concerning human association by using only the knowledge we now have. Clinical experience often reveals and sets the problem, but scientific discovery has its taproot in theoretical research. So I am agnostic as to the possibility or desirability of attempting a "science of human relations." I fear that it would be an abortion.

The philanthropic foundations have given large support to the most fundamental research in the physical and biological sciences. In the field of the social sciences they have generously supported the Social Science Research Council but so far it has concerned itself chiefly with collaboration between the social sciences. It might be more profitable if the foundations and the Social Science Research Council could lend larger leadership and financial support to the building up of a body of established principles in the separate disciplines. While this is a matter of policy upon which there are sharp differences of opinion, we cannot escape the fact that science necessarily involves a division of labor and the approach to the same phenomena from different points of view. Although it is true that some of the most fruitful discoveries being made in physical and biological sciences are in the border fields between them, this would not be possible if each of them had not already accumulated a considerable body of well established concepts, principles and techniques.

3. *Research Teams.* Some of the greatest advances in physical sciences are coming through the teamwork of scientists in industrial laboratories. We hear less of individual Edisons or Marconis and more of

research teams. Do we not need more active collaboration between teams of sociologists in the discovery of new truth rather than so many aspiring star performers? We seem to have an excess of the latter and too few who are willing to work together for discovering and testing new truth regardless of individual credit.<sup>30</sup> We are keen on showing the flaws in the work of our colleagues, but how often do we collaborate with each other to discover the truth on which we can agree, rather than to merely refute the partial truth? Teamwork on the practical problems in which government and industry are using social scientists may give impetus to new attitudes in this regard. Sociology has been much better on the theory of cooperation than in its practice in scientific research.

4. *Test Research by Application.* Although we need more emphasis on fundamental scientific research and more teamwork in its prosecution, our results can be validated only by trying them out, by applying them practically to the solution of social problems. I am quite in sympathy with Lynd's thesis of "*Knowledge for What?*"<sup>31</sup> This is no time for social researchers to sit in their ivory towers. We should test out whatever knowledge we think we have by applying it to existing situations. Social research for the government, like that of industrial research laboratories, has the advantage of being conducted in a dynamic situation in which its findings are immediately put to a practical test.<sup>32</sup> Fundamental research is sterile, its value is unproven, without its application. This is being admirably demonstrated by many of our number whose training and ability is being used by the government in the present crisis. However they may be officially designated, they are showing that sociology has a very definite contribution to make to the problems of democracy. May we give them all the support possible, and

<sup>30</sup> Cf., the last presidential address of Stuart A. Queen, "Can Sociologists Face Reality?", *American Sociological Review*, 7: 11.

<sup>31</sup> Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge for What?* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1939.

<sup>32</sup> Cf., Carl C. Taylor, "Social Theory and Social Action," *Rural Sociology*, 5: 17-31, March, 1940.



may we through research and teaching also aid in the larger problems which will arise in attempting to achieve a just and durable peace based on a larger degree of democracy.

5. *Professional Organization.* Sociology has made and will increasingly make a large contribution to the growth of democracy. We as sociologists have a responsibility for enlarging its influence to this end. To do this we must greatly strengthen this Society, our national professional organization, so that it may advance sociology effectively. Our annual meetings and the publication of our official journal (the *American Sociological Review*) afford the means for reporting our findings and for an exchange of ideas. They promote a certain *esprit de corps*, which needs strengthening. This Society might do much more to promote the type of research suggested above if we could finance committee meetings for planning and synthesizing it. Such work has been impossible this year because of lack of funds. With larger funds this Society could do much to promote the use of sociology and sociologists in both governmental and private agencies, and to increase the application of sociological research in various movements toward a wider democracy.

The number of those employed professionally in sociology is increasing rapidly. Membership in this Society should be a prerequisite for professional employment. Had we twice the number of members we now have and if we paid due commensurate with our belief in the importance of our calling,

these objectives would have the possibility of realization.

As professional students of human association and group life, let us first give attention to a reexamination of the structure and function of our own national organization and let us give it a more intensive loyalty and larger support.<sup>33</sup> We should be studying it and evolving plans for its future. We should find ways and means for it to lead in enabling sociology to fulfill its responsibility as a means to the coming of democracy.

In these days of world tragedy many of us often feel ill at ease in not being actively engaged in work to win the war. But if we take the longer view we become aware that physical victory cannot win the war of ideas, that real democracy cannot be forced into the hearts of men. A better understanding of the nature and processes of society, including those human values which make for survival,<sup>34</sup> is essential to enable men to desire real democracy. We must bring men to appreciate that, although force is necessary to police society, only the ideals which rule men's hearts can ever ensure a permanent peace. In this conviction that our work is necessary toward a durable peace may we renew our faith in the responsibility and opportunity of our profession for discovering and proclaiming those truths concerning social organization which are necessary for creating a wider and truer democracy.

<sup>33</sup> See Stuart A. Queen, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>34</sup> Cf., R. W. Gerard, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 83-84, concerning the survival values of co-operation and altruism.