THE PROFESSION: REPORTS AND OPINION

IN MEMORIAM

RICHARD HENRY TAWNEY
(1880–1962)

R. H. Tawney was one of the seminal minds who contributed to a number of the most important intellectual and cultural movements that have been central to the social sciences of our time, and particularly to sociology. By discipline he was, in the first instance, an historian, and, within that, an economic historian, specializing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England. He was certainly one of the most eminent of the historical scholars dealing with that period. Essentially, he took as his principal theme the "origins of capitalism," both in agriculture and in industry and commerce.

The economists of Tawney's generation, especially in England, were, however, particularly concerned with the problems of public policy. One important wing among them tended to take the radical view with reference to the society of their time, to be its critics and members of the most important movement looking to its radical transformation, the Labor movement. The link between the historical interests of Tawney and his role as an active labor intellectual was provided by the economic component, since the critical problems of his own time were defined by him and others as "economic." Hence, it seemed almost obvious that their antecedents should also be looked for in the economic situations of earlier periods.

Tawney pursued four careers: as scholar, teacher, writer, and man of affairs. He undertook many important studies in his special field. He served for many years as Reader and Professor at the London School of Economics. He was, of course, an eminent writer of "Tracts for the Times." He was also an important man of affairs, particularly, perhaps, as president of the Workers Education Association for several years, as a member of the famous Coal Commission of 1919, and one of the early members of the University Grants' Committee. He was by no means an ivory tower intellectual alone.

It would, I think, be fair to say that Tawney regarded both his historical scholarship and his knowledge of modern economics primarily instrumentally. He was above all a moralist, deeply concerned with understanding, in full historical depth, what he felt to be the moral problems of his time, and, within his capacity, to make a personal contribution to their solution, both through the influence of his writing and lecturing, and through his practical activities of the sort just mentioned.

Furthermore, the grounding of Tawney's moralism was directly and self-consciously religious. He was a devout Anglican, leaning to the High Church side. Hence, though his basis of moral criticism of modern Western society overlapped importantly with that of the more generally understood radical left, especially the Marxist groups, it was still in many respects essentially different.

Tawney's social criticism involved two main themes, on each of which he wrote a well-known book, first, the famous *The Acquisitive Society,* and some years later, *Equality.* His general moral reference point was the Christian conception of a functional society in which each unit, particularly each individual person, should serve the common interest and the needs of the other members. Relative to this ideal, he saw, first, an enormous development of the pursuit of self-interest, not necessarily or always at the expense of the interests of others and of the commonalty, but certainly independent of and very often in conflict with them. Then, this pursuit of self-interest, the fruits of which came to be protected in law and by the authority of government, was understood to be the primary source of what Tawney, with many others, felt to be a peculiarly ob-

jectionable level of inequality, not only involving the flaunting of wealth and luxury by the rich, but—the main concern for Tawney—the deprivation of the lower income groups from access to the essentials necessary for a life of human dignity, and for fair opportunity for self-help through health, education, and the like.

Tawney's socialism was primarily an ethical and a consumers' socialism. He was not primarily, like the Marxists, concerned with the power structure of capitalist society, nor indeed with its place in a grand scheme of historical evolution, but with the ethical quality of human relations and the attendant problems of distributive justice. Indeed, not only was class conflict as such a secondary theme, but he tended on the whole to take the bases of increasing productivity for granted, as somehow given in the resources of an advancing technology. It is also important that he never for a moment doubted the moral and substantive validity of political democracy—he was never in the least tempted by totalitarian socialism.

This complex of problems forms the main link between Tawney's historical studies and his role as a socialist intellectual. His historical work was, above all, centered on the process and conditions of the "rise of individualism," the breaking down of the institutional controls which medieval society had imposed on self-interest. Tawney was fully cognizant of the conflict of these older controls with increased productivity, and one can say that perhaps his main attitudes were "consistently ambivalent" about the process as a whole. He knew the untenability of the old system, but he felt deeply that a new system of control was needed.

Though his early contributions were in the agricultural field, it can perhaps be said that the central problem came to a head for Tawney in the issue of usury, particularly in the relation of organized religion to the control system. It is significant that his massively learned Introduction to the republication of Thomas Wilson's *Discourse on Usury* preceded *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* by several years. The latter may be considered to be a generalization of the problems and analysis of the former.

Sociologists naturally are particularly interested in the relation of Tawney's contributions in this area to those of Max Weber. The two have often been virtually identified, but in spite of the important relation, I think wrongly so. They are together in their common emphasis on the importance of religion in this historical-social context. They also share the view that the Protestant movement was split in this regard, and that, in its influence on economic development, the Lutheran branch, especially Luther himself, was virtually medieval, whereas the Calvinist branch, including Calvin, was much more "favorable" to the general trends of economic development. Later Puritanism was even more so.

Nevertheless, the differences are profound. Tawney throughout contrasted economic individualism with ethical rigor in a sense which precluded a positive ethical component in the former. He saw the development of such individualism as a process of breakdown of moral standards, not a new type of such standards. To him, Calvin, in contrast to Luther, was a "modern mind" who had absorbed important parts of the secular culture of the Renaissance. This made Calvin so much more receptive to the needs of economic development than was Luther. According to Tawney, later Puritanism's substantially stronger endorsement of economic individualism could be accounted for not by a process of development internal to the religious position, but by certain economic and political developments external to the religious movement. Indeed, I think it correct to say that for Tawney the influence of Protestantism on Capitalism was overwhelmingly permissive, a weakening of resistances to its alleged amoralism, and that moral controls had to be re-established from outside these religious sources, either from those branches of Christianity which had remained relatively uncontaminated by "liberal" Protestant tolerance of self-interest, or by new secular morality from socialist sources.

Weber's essential position was quite different. He contended that ascetic Protestantism incorporated a new positive pattern of religiously grounded ethics which justified release of many of the older restrictions on free secular activity, including, but not confined, to the economic field. But, at the same time, in Weber's view, ascetic Protestantism

imposed a new rigorism, especially with reference to the obligation to active work, to contribute to productivity. Furthermore, the development from Calvin to the later Puritans was by no means only, or even mainly, one of adaptation to changing external circumstances. It involved an "unfolding" of the latent implications of the religious position itself. Weber's general position here is very close to Durkheim's conception of the *institutionalized* individualism, of "organic solidarity," whereas basically, Tawney is closer to the position of Spencer, which Durkheim criticized.

There is not space here to elaborate this discussion. Suffice it to say that the issue between Tawney and Weber is a case of what is probably still the most important line of division in the historical-sociological interpretation of the genesis of the modern industrial order. Since sociologists are becoming increasingly concerned with these problems of historical development, it is particularly important not to be confused about the differences between two such eminent analysts of this problem in the last generation.

Broadly, then, Tawney may be considered, for the sociologist, to have been among the most important figures in his generation in forming the climate of opinion in which an important part of contemporary sociology is working. The broad field of his primary relevance may be said to be "economic sociology." He did much to make salient the historical dimension in this field. As moralist rather than scientist, he was much concerned with his own society. He was not an abstract philosopher. He figured importantly in defining a salient intermediate field of great significance to our discipline. On the one hand, as critic of the economic individualism of his time, he emphasized the need for something other than economics in order to understand it. But, on the other hand, as a thorough-going democrat, with deep religious grounding of his democracy, he was immune to the trends of socialist thought which led over into totalitarianism. His name will long be honored among the founders of twentieth century social thought.

TALCOTT PARSONS
Harvard University

EDWARD FRANKLIN FRAZIER (1894–1962)

Edward Franklin Frazier died in Washington, D.C. on May 17, 1962. He had undergone major surgery six months previously, but had recovered sufficiently to resume his academic duties in February. As Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Howard University, he was carrying a full-time teaching program, and was engaged in research activities as well, when he was fatally stricken.

Frazier was born in Baltimore, Maryland, on September 24, 1894. His undergraduate degree was completed with honors at Howard University in 1916. He earned a Master's degree in sociology at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1920 and a doctorate in the same field at the University of Chicago in 1931. In the interval between his graduate degrees, he studied at the New York School of Social Work (1920–1921) and at the University of Copenhagen (1921–1922). His sociological views were influenced by many of his teachers, but he referred most often to the impressions made upon him by Professor Frank Hankins at Clark and Professors Ernest Burgess and Robert Park at Chicago.

There was on Frazier's part a dedication to academic life, and his contributions lie mainly in his teaching and research activities. In both of these areas he had rich and manifold experiences. In his jocular manner, he delighted in relating that he had taught in every type of educational institution. His emphasis was always upon the degree to which the institutions he served fulfilled what he regarded to be their mission.

His pedagogical career began at Tuskegee Institute in 1916. Later, he held regular appointments, in turn, at Morehouse College, The Atlanta School of Social Work, and Fisk University, before joining the faculty of Howard University in 1934 as Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology. He served at different periods as visiting professor, part-time teacher or lecturer at Livingstone College, the New York School of Social Work, New York University, Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Southern California, Carleton College, the University of California at Berkeley, and the School of

Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University.

Frazier's broad learning and passionate concern for discovering what he termed the "social reality" made him an excellent model for students. His humor, clarity in communication, and love of interaction in classroom situations won for him the admiration and respect of students. Three months before his death, students at Howard University, in acknowledgement of his scholarly achievements and contributions to the intellectual life of the University, set up a lecture series in his honor, with Professor Everett Hughes of Brandeis University, Frazier's long-time friend and respected professional colleague, serving as the first guest lecturer.

An incomplete compilation of Professor Frazier's published works lists 8 books, 89 articles, and 18 chapters in books edited by others. His most significant research contribution was *The Negro Family in the United States* (1939), which analyzed the historical, social, and economic forces serving to shape the Negro family and assessed the influence of family life upon the behavior of Negroes. The publication of this volume provided an impetus to the emergent tendency to interpret problems of Negro life and behavior in a sociological frame of reference, rather than in terms which attributed problem conditions among Negroes to their innate inferiority. The volume also made a substantial contribution to the literature on the American family. It represented a development of Frazier's earlier studies of the subject which resulted in *The Negro Family in Chicago* and *The Free Negro Family,* both of which appeared in 1932. Frazier's interests in a number of research areas—community studies, ecology, stratification, personality, race and culture—coalesced in his studies of the Negro family.

Black Bourgeoisie, published first in French in 1955, and two years later in English, was an analysis of the origin, development, and style of life of the Negro middle class. This work proved to be highly controversial, with some persons regarding it as a mere polemic and others as an exaggerated profile of the class discussed. Its insights and descriptions proved painful to many of its readers. Its satirical style bears a kinship to the technique employed by Frazier in an earlier essay, "The Pathology of Race Prejudice" (*Forum,* June, 1927), in which an analogy was drawn between the mechanisms which operate in the minds of white southerners with prejudice toward the Negro and those which characterize the thought processes of insane persons. (Upon the publication of this article, Frazier was forced by a white mob to leave Atlanta where he was then teaching.) *Black Bourgeoisie* and "The Pathology of Race Prejudice," though published more than a quarter of a century apart, where tied together by more than a common style. In both of these works, Frazier demonstrated his determination to describe, analyze, and evaluate social reality as he perceived it, even when he was fully conscious that his evaluation would not be accepted by a great many readers.

The pressures which operate upon Negro intellectuals to engage in race politics and propaganda were resisted by Frazier. W. E. B. DuBois, a scholar-turned-propagandist whom Frazier greatly admired, once stated that Frazier stuck to his academic knitting. It was Frazier's conviction that the true role of the academic man was the development and publication of scientific knowledge. Though, as a realist, he fully recognized that scientific findings are not always immediately accepted by decision-makers, he also knew that eventually such findings make an impact upon society. In line with his beliefs in this regard, Frazier accepted few non-academic appointments. Of those he did accept, two are deserving of mention. Following the race riot in Harlem in 1935, he directed a study of the social and economic causes of the outbreak for the Mayor's Commission on Conditions in Harlem. In 1951–1953 he served as Chief of the Division of Applied Social Sciences of UNESCO.

Many honors were bestowed upon Frank Frazier by his professional colleagues. He served as president of the District of Columbia and Eastern Sociological societies and, in 1948, was president of the American Sociological Society. He was president-elect of the African Studies Association, of which he was a founding member. He also held important offices in several international sociological organizations. Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland, awarded him the hon-

orary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1955, and he was similarly honored by the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1960. For *Black Bourgeoisie* he received, in 1956, the first MacIver Lectureship Award given by the American Sociological Society.

In addition to being a fine exponent of the best tradition in American sociology and scholarship, Frank Frazier was a vital human personality who enjoyed a wide circle of professional friends in this country and abroad. He was a tough-minded intellectual who persevered in rising above many of the frustrations he encountered in Negro educational institutions and community life. His passing marks the end of a distinguished career and a significant loss to the sociological fraternity and to his many friends.

G. FRANKLIN EDWARDS
Howard University

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY: A PILOT STUDY IN METHODOLOGY

HELEN G. TIBBITTS
U. S. Public Health Service

The question of the effect that federal government support of research may be having upon scientific development in this country is one which deeply interests everyone devoted to extending the boundaries of knowledge. This is a large and complex problem, and no satisfactory measures of effect exist. In the meantime, it appears pertinent to inquire into the extent to which current contributions to the development of specific scientific fields have come from work which has been financed in part at least from sources outside of the investigator's own institution. This report will attempt a pilot analysis of this latter problem for the field of sociology. Much of the report is devoted to an effort to develop a framework and a methodology for such an analysis.

SOCIOLOGICAL ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN 1961

The problem of this report requires, first, some means of identifying contributions to the development of sociology, then, data on external support, and finally, a system for classifying the nature of the contribution. The first two requirements are met relatively satisfactorily if it is assumed, and this seems a reasonable assumption, that the editorial boards of national sociological journals select articles for publication on the basis of their scientific contribution, and accordingly these articles will be used as the data to be analyzed.[1] This source will provide data on financial support as well as provide the substance of major current contributions to sociology. As a pilot study, the present analysis will be restricted to the articles published during the calendar year 1961 in the following journals: *American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, Social Forces, Sociological Inquiry, Sociology and Social Research,* and *Sociometry.* With respect to the selection of journals to be canvassed, it is contended only that the articles published in them are important to sociology, not that they encompass all of the work which is important to the field. In order to get at the nature of the contribution, articles will be classified by field and by type of content (whether a theoretical formulation, *per se,* theoretically oriented research, or research which is preponderantly empirical). These two classifications pose the methodological problems to which most of this report is devoted.

The total number of articles published[2] during 1961 in the journals covered by this report and the number acknowledging support from various sources are shown in Table 1. It is clear that of the work which was reported in this year, 40 per cent had had financial support, 16 per cent being supported by federal sources.

Three studies in the last twenty-five years have reported the rank order of emphasis on fields of sociology at different points of time.[3] The two earliest studies were based on course offerings listed in college catalogs, while the third and latest is based on specialties listed in ASA directories, papers read at annual meetings,

[1] A similar problem with reference to anthropology was studied by Goldstein, who also used articles published in national anthropological journals as the source of data. See Marcus S. Goldstein, "Recent Trends in Physical Anthropology," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology,* 26 (March, 1940), pp. 191–209.

[2] Reports published in special departments are included only if they were judged to bear on substantive problems of sociology. Book reviews, however, are excluded.

[3] Richard L. Simpson, "Expanding and Declining Fields in American Sociology," *American Sociological Review,* 26 (June, 1961), pp. 458–466. Lawrence Podell, Martin Vogelfanger, and Roberta Rogers, "Sociology in American Colleges: Fifteen Years Later," *American Sociological Review,* 24 (February, 1959), pp. 87–95. Raymond Kennedy and Ruby Jo Kennedy, "Sociology in American Colleges," *American Sociological Review,* 7 (October, 1942), pp. 661–675.